THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

RE-ESTABLISHED BY A. T. RICE AND LLOYD BRYCE.

EDITED BY DAVID A. MUNRO.

1952

167

VOL. CLXVII.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

BIBLIOTEKA,
X. X. MISYONARZY
ERIE, PA.

NEW YORK:
291 FIFTH AVENUE.
1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Copyright, 1898, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING CO.

All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. D.

JULY, 1898.

WHAT BRITAIN HAS DONE FOR EGYPT.

BY RALPH RICHARDSON, F. R. S. E., F. S. A., SCOT., HONORARY SECRETARY OF THE ROYAL SCOTTISH GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY.

WHEN I left for Egypt last December I took with me the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for that month, containing Mr. Penfield's remarkable article, entitled "England's Absorption of Egypt." I may mention at once that neither in Britain nor in Egypt have I ever heard the term "absorption" applied to the British "occupation" of Egypt; and I have never received, either at home or abroad, any corroboration of Mr. Penfield's assertion that my countrymen led strangers to believe that Egypt has "been severed from the Ottoman Empire and incorporated as an integral part of Queen Victoria's realm." He maintains that by unparalleled audacity Britain has taken possession of Egypt, the fact being that Britain intervened in 1882 to save Egypt from anarchy and that the occupation of Egypt by Britain was and is desired and sanctioned by four out of the six Great Powers of Europe.

The reason why the British occupation continues is that, if it ceased, the prosperity of Egypt, the result of Britain's magnificent work there since 1882, would come to an end. I shall proceed to point out in detail what Britain has done for Egypt, but I may preface my remarks by stating that none are more cognizant

Copyright, 1898, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of, or grateful for, the benefits conferred by Britain upon their country than the Egyptian natives themselves. To them the year 1882 marks a new departure, a turning point in the history of their sorely tried country, a year when oppression came to an end, when justice was done, when liberty and peace were at last enjoyed, when savage modes of collecting taxes ceased, when a man's life and property were safe, when Egypt, after centuries of misrule, again knew what security and prosperity mean.

To show that I am not exaggerating when I maintain that these are the opinions of the natives of Egypt, I refer to a pamphlet written by one of their number which was published at Cairo in January, 1898. It is entitled *"Le Fellah ou la Reaction Dementie. Par un Jeune Egyptien, Ahmed Mokbel."* The pamphlet is written in French, an ironical compliment to the three French newspapers in Cairo which daily abuse the British Administration. Ahmed Mokbel contrasts the tyranny under which the Egyptian fellah so long suffered with the justice, sympathy and liberty he has received since the British administration began. "If," he says, "there is anyone in Egypt who ought to express his gratitude to and satisfaction with the British, it is undoubtedly the fellah. Before the British came, the fellah was a being always shunned and disowned; if anyone stooped to address him, it was only with contempt or with the aid of the *Courbache*, the sole interpreter between him and his superiors.

Ahmed Mokbel then refers with scorn to the French newspapers in Cairo.

> "No matter," he declares, "what incendiary and fanatical journals may assert in order to incite the fellah against the British occupation, this is what the fellah replies:
>
> "'You say and repeat that the British bear us ill-will; that they cause us much evil; that they will soon establish a Protectorate over us, etc.
>
> "'Well, what does that matter to us now, seeing that before the British came we were treated like beasts and that since their occupation we are actually regarded as human beings?'
>
> "If among my readers there are any who doubt the truth of what I say, let them travel through the fields of Egypt and put this question to the fellah: 'Do you like the British? What do you think of them?' They will hear the fellah exclaim:
>
> "'I like the British; yes, I like them with all my heart, as much as I like my own children.'"

This outburst of gratitude is a remarkable tribute to the beneficence of British rule in Egypt. When the French governed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Egypt they certainly never received it. How much would they give to obtain a similar tribute from a single native of one of their African possessions!*

Let us, however, hear in more detail and in Ahmed Mokbel's own words the grounds of the fellaheen's gratefulness to their British administrators. He represents a fellah giving the following reasons for liking the British:

"(1.) The British abolished for me the accursed torture of the *Courbache*, enabling me to live longer for my children than my unfortunate father was able to live for me and my brothers.

"(2.) The British have protected me from tyrants.

"(3.) Thanks to them, I pay no taxes which I ought not to pay.

"(4.) I am no more harnessed to the plough, as I formerly was, to gratify the caprice or pleasure of the cruel Turks.

"(5.) Thanks to the British, I no longer behold lying on the ground, bathed in blood, the body of my beloved wife, the innocent companion of my misfortunes and sufferings—a homicide which was formerly committed with impunity and relish throughout Egypt. The only relief for me then was to let my heart weep, for I dared not weep publicly.

"(6.) Thanks to the British, I enjoy my frugal evening meal surrounded by my children, and I am clad in winter better than in summer.

"(7.) Thanks to the British, my young cotton plants do not perish for want of water as formerly, when water was only given abundantly to rich proprietors at a high price, while we poor devils of fellaheen, having nothing to offer, saw our plants dying of drought.

"In one word, I prefer the British to all others, and, that being the case, would it be reasonable for me to complain of them?"

Such is the testimony of a native of Egypt. What is there to set against it? That of the French Egyptian newspapers airing the opinions of the small French colony in Egypt; or that of some French tourist like M. Louis Malosse, whose "*Impressions d' Egypte,*" published at Paris in 1896, show through what yellow and distorting spectacles French travellers view everything in Egypt since 1882. I cannot add that of Mr. Penfield, for, after sharply attacking British methods of government, he somewhat illogically adds: "For half a dozen years Egypt has fairly bristled with prosperity. The story of that country's emergence

* Baron de Malortie, an independent authority, shows that from the time of Mohammed Ali (the founder of the Khedivial dynasty) the French were disliked and mistrusted alike by Khedive, officials and natives. (*Egypt*, 1882, pp. 47 and 272.) Sir Alfred Milner remarks: "The disposition of France to bully Egypt does not date from 1882. . . . Cordial detestation of French diplomacy, bitter resentment of the manner in which France took every possible advantage of the dependent position of Egypt" was always evinced by every Egyptian native official (*England in Egypt*, 1893, p. 420).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from practical bankruptcy until its securities are quoted nearly as high as English consols reads like a romance; and there is no better example of economical progress, through administrative reform, than is presented by Egypt under British rule."

When we recollect that, according to the census of June 1, 1897, the population of Egypt proper was 9,654,233, while the European residents in Egypt were estimated in 1896 to number only 112,000,* it is evident that if the British administration gives satisfaction to the natives of Egypt Britain has fulfilled her mission there. I have cited a native's opinion. Let me also cite that of *Al Mokattam*, the great native newspaper of Cairo, appearing daily in Arabic. In an issue in January last it declared: "Everyone admits that the means of subsistence have been improved by the reforms introduced by the British occupation. *Life in Egypt is very much better now than formerly.*" I took every opportunity when in Egypt of gauging the correctness of these opinions and whatever strictures on British government I heard proceed from the French colony and its sympathizers. I never heard anything but enthusiastic laudation of British rule from the natives themselves. "Egypt for the Egyptians" was declared by Lord Dufferin to be the watchword of Britain in Egypt, and if the millions are satisfied the thousands must put up with the administration. But, from personal inquiry, I am convinced that the majority of the Europeans in Egypt, who are Greek and Italian traders (the French being a very small minority), are so pleased with the peace and security afforded by British rule, that they would not have any other substituted.

In stating the benefits conferred upon Egypt since the British occupation began in 1882, the difficulty is to know where to commence. Nearly everything has been changed in Egypt since 1882 and, in the opinion of the natives, everything has been changed for the better. Looking back upon pre-British times with horror and indignation, Ahmed Mokbel exclaims: "What a difference from the situation to-day! The fellaheen, formerly so despised, so degraded, so terrorized, have won a place in the sunshine of liberty and equality and speak with confidence."

Perhaps the first thing that now strikes the European on arriving in Egypt is the universal observance of law and order. The cause of that is the magnificent police force instituted and or-

* *Baedeker's Hand-Book*, 4th Edn., 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ganized by the British administration. Formerly Port Saïd was described as a "hell upon earth." I walked with ladies through its streets after 11 one night and quietness and order were everywhere apparent. The reason was obvious. The town is now thoroughly policed, the police station occupying the center of the town and a policeman being stationed at every street junction. Of course the policemen are all Egyptians, and a more intelligent or sturdier force could not be found. Nor do police duties end there. Stands for carts and donkeys are at fixed sites throughout Cairo, each stand bearing the number of carts or donkeys to be accommodated; cabs and drivers have their numbers, tramways have their stations. The policeman is even called in, as at Philae, to enable tourists to see the temples unmolested by beggars; and when he disappears above the first cataract and the unhappy tourist is mobbed by an entire village demanding with one voice "Bakshish!" the traveller realizes what Lower Egypt must have been like before 1882, and thanks heaven for the British administration.

While the British insured law and order throughout Egypt by the formation of an effective police, they also relieved the fellah from two of the greatest scourges to which he had long been subject, viz., the *Corvée* and the *Courbache*, French terms which have no English equivalent, being foreign to Anglo-Saxon ideas. By means of the *Corvée*, the Khedive or Government in pre-British days could summon from their agricultural labors any number of fellaheen, and could employ them for any length of time on any manner of work the officials chose, the pay of the fellaheen being *nil* and their food sometimes bread and onions. It was doubtless an extremely cheap mode of labor for the governing classes, but a gross abuse of power. Probably the Pyramids and the Temples of the Pharaohs were built in this way, but in those old pagan days cruelty and oppression went hand in hand. It is extraordinary, however, to find Pharaonic practices existing so late in Egypt as during the making of the Suez Canal, when the forced labor of the natives involved the sacrifice of thousands of lives, under French auspices.* Since 1888 forced labor has only been used for the protection of the Nile banks during the period of flood. Previous to that year the *Corvée*

* "The forced labor of the peasantry in digging the canal was found to involve such intolerable hardships, that Ismail Pasha was obliged to put a stop to it."—Milner's *England in Egypt*, p. 419.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

involved the employment of some 200,000 men every year for 100 days. This wretched system was finally abolished in 1888.*

If the *Corveé* was a burden, the *Courbache* was a terror to the peasantry of Egypt, a peasantry I may add than which none is more gentle, courteous and good-natured, making their oppression all the more shameful, if also all the more easy. I have to return to Ahmed Mokbel's pamphlet for details of the *Courbache,* which he designates "a vile instrument made of leather of the length of a metre, to which death is a thousand times preferable." He describes the revolting manner in which it was applied to a peasant in pre-British days:

"The fellah was compelled to pay a second time the tax which he had already paid, and if he had nothing wherewith to satisfy the greed of his village tyrant, woe, woe to him! He was hurled brutally to the ground, all the satellites of the despot flung themselves upon him and flogged him with the *Courbache;* and they never left off till the poor wretch, drenched with blood and with his limbs mutilated, had almost ceased to breathe."

This terrible picture shows what an abode of cruelty Egypt was ere administered by Britain.† Yet there are actually some ignorant or designing persons who invite the fellaheen, after passing through all these horrors, to intrust themselves and their families once more to Turkish rule and to demand the evacuation of Egypt by the British. What says Ahmed Mokbel to this? "Illusions! for if ten, a hundred, or even a thousand persons are favorable to the evacuation, six millions are opposed to it." In other words, while a small coterie in Cairo may favor the evacuation, the great mass of the people of Egypt is opposed to it. Now that the native Egyptians are enjoying the light and liberty of British government, they are not such fools as to desire to return to the darkness and slavery of former times.

Mr. Penfield devotes considerable space to showing the error the British administration committed in not making English the official language of Egypt. This seems to me to prove the gentleness and unselfishness of British rule. To please those Egyptians and others who are accustomed to speak French, British officials continue to use it, just as, to please the natives, they

* Lord Cromer's Report, 1897, p. 13.

† That the picture is not overdrawn we may believe when we find M. Malosse saying: "*Le temps est loin où un malheureux Egyptien des provinces, maltraité par son gouverneur qui lui avait enlevé sa femme et qui le faisait assommer à coups de courbache, mourait sous la bastonnade, s'ecriant, 'Il n'y a de justice qu'au tribunal de Dieu!'*" Fortunately justice for the natives of Egypt arrived in 1882.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have never interfered in any way with the Mohammedan religion. One would have imagined that this would make the British popular, but Mr. Penfield strangely argues that "the administrative blunder of the English in not bringing in their language with their intelligent reforms is half responsible for the unpopularity of the occupation, whose benefits would surely be obliterated and forgotten six months after the departure of the last British functionary."

But is it true that the benefits conferred by Britain upon Egypt would be forgotten six months after the last British functionary left; or, as M. Malosse puts it, "after their last soldier departed from Alexandria?" Let us suppose that the Egyptian natives forgot, as, however, they are not likely to do, that it was to Britain they owed the abolition of the *Courbache* and the *Corveé* and the stoppage of the robbery of their water supply. Are there no lasting benefits conferred by Britain, no monuments which will remain for many generations and attest the energy, enterprise and beneficence of the rulers of Egypt from 1882 onward? The ancient Romans left imperishable memorials in the provinces they administered. May the modern Romans, the Britons, not do likewise in Egypt?

A railway is an institution of probably as lasting a character as any. What has the British administration done for the construction of railways in Egypt?

In Dr. Blackie's "*Comprehensive Atlas,*" published in 1883, the railway from Cairo up the Nile valley is marked as extending no further than Assiût, so that we may take that town as the terminus of the Nile Railway when the British administration began. What has been done in railroad building since 1882? The railway, which then stopped at Assiût, 247 miles from Cairo, has now been extended past Luxor and Assuan to Shellâl (above the first cataract) 586 miles from Cairo. A military railway 23 miles in length ascends from Wadi Halfa above the second cataract, while another, some 50 miles in length, proceeds from Trinkitat to Tokar on the Red Sea littoral. Still more enterprising, a railway 300 miles in length has been constructed from Wadi Halfa across the desert to Bash Tenal, 73 miles south of Abu Hamed and 60 miles below Berber. Thus, when peace is restored, the traveller, who, before the British took Egypt in hand, could only go by railway from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cairo to Assiût, will be able, with the exception of the comparatively short stretch from Shellâl to Wadi Halfa, to go by railway the whole way from Cairo to above the Fifth Cataract. The British have carried the railway and all its attendant benefits into the recesses of Nubia, into the heart of the Egyptian Sûdan, and yet we find Mr. Penfield echoing M. Malosse's assertion that they will be forgotten in Egypt when their last battalion departs! Will that magnificent railroad not of itself remain as a monument of British enterprise, resembling some of the works of the ancient Romans which still fill us with wonder and admiration?

Let us turn to another field of British industry. When my countrymen arrived in Egypt they found the Barrage* in ruins and useless. That celebrated work was begun under Mohammed Ali in 1835 and remained in operation till 1867.

It then gave way and the irrigation works dependent on it were rendered ineffectual. The whole cost of the Barrage amounting to £1,800,000, besides the unpaid labor of the peasantry forced to build it, had been wasted. As Sir Alfred Milner remarks, the Barrage "was practically useless till Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff came to Egypt" in 1884. As Director of Public Works, Sir Colin began the repair of the Barrage; he and his Anglo-Indian officials worked at its repair for five years, and after an expenditure of £460,000 completely restored it. Since 1890 it has operated successfully and been of untold value to Egyptian agriculture. Is this not also a monument erected by Britain in Egypt?

But the Barrage is only a small installment of a vast irrigation scheme devised and carried out by the British administration. "The country," says Milner, "was divided into five circles of irrigation—three in the Delta and two in Upper Egypt." As the fertility of Egypt is entirely dependent on irrigation, the masterly manner in which irrigation was extended throughout the land by the British officials is the keynote of Egypt's prosperity to-day. Take one province as an example. The Fayum, in ancient times, was renowned for its fertility. The famous Lake Moeris was there with its pyramid, statues, and labyrinth as seen and described by Herodotus. Lake Moeris has now shrunk to a comparatively small sheet of water known as Lake Qurûn, but the British administration has by a thorough and judicious

*This is a great dam across the Nile some miles below Cairo.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system of irrigation again made the Fayum the garden of Egypt. I quote from the official work of Major Brown, R. E., now Inspector-General of Irrigation for Lower Egypt, entitled "The Fayum and Lake Moeris," published in 1892 with a preface by Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff. The following table shows the great progress made by the Fayum under even three years of British rule, the quantities being in *kantars* (98 lbs.) and the values in Egyptian pounds (20s. 6d., stg.):

	1889.	1890.	1891.	Value 1891.
Cotton	*39,433*	*56,334*	*86,638*	£147,284
Cottonseed	82,010	104,608	185,917	102,254
Cereals	418,935	797,363	1,109,070	776,349
				£1,025,887

The value of cotton, cottonseed and cereals exported from the Fayum in 1891 was at the rate of £4. 6s. 10d. per acre.

When British engineers undertook the irrigation of Egypt, they found that all-important department in a state which Sir Alfred Milner simply describes as "chaos." "Science and morality had alike been wanting" in the construction and working of irrigation in Egypt. While the officials impoverished the country by adopting wrong systems the rich robbed the poor of the water which is the life, the *sine qua non*, of Egyptian agriculture. The British have changed all that. Baedeker, an impartial German authority, declares that "the modern embankments and apparatus for the regulation of the water supply vie in importance with the greatest ancient works of the kind,"* so that my analogy between Romans and Britons is conceded. The poorest peasant is now as sure of his water supply as the richest Pacha. Speaking for the fellaheen, Ahmed Mokbel praises the British for "establishing one balance for all—for the rich proprietor in his golden palace as well as for the poor peasant in his thatched cottage."

One might imagine that, having done so much to increase the fertility of Egypt and the consequent prosperity and happiness of its inhabitants, the British might rest on their laurels. But they are too energetic a race for that.† They have made Lower Egypt a land of plenty; they are going to try and make Upper Egypt a land of plenty, too. They propose to build two

* *Handbook for Egypt*, 4th Ed., 1898.

† "*L'énergie dans les actes et la rapidité dans les décisions sont les deux grands moyens pratiqués par les gouvernants anglais.*"—*Impressions d'Egypte par M. Malosse*, 1896.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

colossal new Barrages, one at the First Cataract and one at Assiût. The first will be a great masonry structure a mile and a quarter long, and will hold in reserve for purposes of irrigation some thousand million cubic metres of water. The second will be similar in character, and is intended to raise the level of the Nile during summer, thus increasing the distributing power of the canals in Middle Egypt.*

Cynical French critics are evidently of opinion that the financial exploitation of Egypt and good salaries for British officials are the main, if not only, attractions which Egypt offers to Britain. Even the amiable M. Georges Noblemaire in his "*En Congé*" published at Paris in 1897, has his fling at "that veritable golden egg of British officialdom, the Egyptian Budget." Can these flippant gentlemen imagine no tie binding Britain to Egypt other than that of "filthy lucre?" Are they not aware that all the way up the Nile, ay, as far as Khartum, are the graves of those who gallantly fought and bled and died in Britain's and in Egypt's cause, and will they, Frenchmen and *galants hommes*, deny that these graves form an indissoluble link between Britain and Egypt? Standing on the summit of the Awas-el-Guarâni, the hill of the holy man, near Korosko, I saw beneath me the rude caravan track across the desert leading to Abu Hamed, which General Gordon followed on his last ride to Khartum. On a slope above the Wâdi, which the hero passed, I saw the little graveyard where sleep the British soldiers who fell around Korosko. A voyage up the Nile is not all a pleasure tour to the patriotic Briton, for he is often reminded of those, his countrymen, who laid down their lives in order that he might enjoy this pleasant cruise in safety and that his race might govern the valley of the Nile.

Sentiments like these are not confined to British travellers. In the steamers in which we ascended the Nile to its Second Cataract the company consisted one-third of British tourists, one-third of other Europeans, and one-third of tourists from the United States of America. It was a time of war, when British battalions were hurrying to the front to capture Omdurman, to crush the Dervishes and to avenge Gordon. And I noticed that none cheered the British soldiers more heartily than our kin from across the Atlantic. Observing some American girls waving their

* *Daily News*, Feb. 22, 1898. *Times*, March 22, 1898.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handkerchiefs and cheering as the Cameron Highlanders sailed past us up the Nile, I ventured to ask them what interest they took in these soldiers, seeing that they were British soldiers. "We, too, have British blood!" was the American girls' instant reply and ample justification.

Americans occupy an important position in extending the prosperity and civilization of modern Egypt.

Not only do they form at least one-third of the tourists visiting Egypt, and number some of the leading Egyptologists, but the beneficent effect of their missions and schools is everywhere apparent throughout Egypt. The magnitude of their Christian operations may be gathered from the fact that the Egyptian mission of the American Presbyterians has 100 stations, 20 churches and 97 schools.* Ask a little Egyptian child where it has learnt its English, and it will very probably answer: "At the American mission." The mission doctors, too, are of much service. An English lady might have died on board our mail steamer had a telegram not been sent to an American mission physician who came on board, attended to her, and removed her to the hospital at Assiût. Egypt has and will always have extraordinary attractions for the Anglo-Saxon race, for it is a race conversant with and believing in its Bible, in which Egypt holds so prominent a place. And let me add that, after a visit to Egypt, the ancient Jewish history, with which we have been familiar from childhood, acquires an interest and reality it never previously possessed.

In order to understand that history, however, we must not tarry at Cairo, but voyage up the Nile. It is generally admitted that no Pharaoh, no Khedive, no administration ever did so much for the opening up and the prosperity of Egypt from Cairo to the Second Cataract as the single British firm of Thomas Cook & Son. They are the real modern "lords of the Nile," all the wharves on which belong to them, all the mail steamers on which fly their flag, while almost all the tourist steamers and *Dahabiyehs* bear their name. They have done extraordinary service to the Egyptian native. They have caused a golden shower of prosperity to descend upon his head which he never knew before; they have relieved the dull round of his existence by a ceaseless flow of European travellers; they have

* *Baedeker's Egypt*, 4th Ed., 1898, p. 202.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enabled him to pass up and down his own highway, the Nile, with an ease and celerity he never before imagined. Finally, they have by their splendid flotilla, ever in readiness, put it in the power of the Egyptian administration instantly to send troops to repel invasion and so prevent the barbarous tribes of the Sudan from destroying in their ruthless march the hard won fruits of the natives' industry, besides massacring the natives themselves.

The reorganization of the Egyptian army is the one great success of the British administration admitted by M. Louis Malosse, so I need not dwell much upon it. Suffice it that I record that out of the faint-hearted Egyptians of Tel-el-Kebir, British discipline and example have produced the lions of Toski and Atbara. The permanent headquarters of the Army are at Cairo, with a staff at Dongola, and another at Suakim. The Egyptian cavalry and artillery have likewise their permanent headquarters at Cairo. The Egyptian infantry consists of 18 battalions, whereof six are Sudanese battalions, magnificent coal-black fellows often over six feet in height. These sons of the Sudan, long the terror of the Egyptians of the Delta, have been converted into their best defenders, just as the Scottish Highlanders after the Rebellion of 1745 furnished Britain with some of her finest regiments. There is also a railway battalion, a camel corps, and a medical staff, besides a military school and a telegraph department, thus equipping Egypt with a complete, well-disciplined and reliable army capable of routing the most determined Dervishes.

With regard to many other reforms introduced by the British administration, and as illustrating still further what Britain has done for Egypt, I feel I cannot do better than give the official memorandum, dated Feb. 18, 1898, published under the high authority of Sir Elwin Palmer, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., Financial Adviser to the Egyptian Ministry. He says:

"The population of Egypt has increased in fifteen years by 2,920,486, *i. e.*, 43 per cent.

"Notwithstanding the increase of about 13 per cent., *i. e.*, 614,195 feddans, in the cultivated area paying taxes, the land tax is now less by £(E)85,691 than in 1881. The average tax per feddan in 1881 was £(st.) 1. 2s; it is now 18s. 3d. The annual tax on land has, since 1891, been reduced by £(E)507,600, other direct taxes have been reduced by £(E)223,000, and indirect taxes amounting to £(E)186,000 per annum have been abolished. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tobacco tax having been raised and the smuggling stopped it now produces over a million, whereas in 1881 the revenue derived from tobacco only amounted to £(E)97,168.

"Scarcely any arrears of land tax now exist, whereas in past years the amounts were very large. The expropriations and sales of crops for arrears have been reduced more than 50 per cent, and are now quite insignificant.

"Since 1890 the policy has been to diminish the direct taxes, covering the loss of revenue by an increase in the indirect taxes, and thus causing a more even distribution of taxes and an increase in the number of taxpayers. The only indirect tax, however, that has been raised is the tobacco tax, while others have been reduced or even abolished entirely.

"The taxation per head of population in 1881 was £ (st.) 1. 2s. 2d.; in 1897 it was 17s. 9d., a reduction of 20 per cent.

"Two hundred and twelve miles of new railway have been opened. There has been an enormous development of the railway and telegraph traffic, second-class passengers having increased from 415,000 to 1,153,000, third-class passengers from 3,100,000 to 9,412,000, and merchandise from 1,275,000 to 2,796,000 tons, while the number of telegrams has increased from 688,000 to 2,498,000, half the number being on account of railway service.

"A similar development in the post office has taken place, letters, newspapers, money orders, etc., having very largely increased in number.

"The expenditure on public instruction has been increased by over 37 per cent.; the number of schools has risen from 29 to 51, and the number of pupils from 5,366 to 11,304.

"The increase in the judicial receipts shows that the people have learnt to take advantage of the courts, especially as regards registration of deeds,

"Large sums of money have been expended of late years on irrigation. *i. e.*, on reproductive works. 1,700 kilometers of agricultural roads, 2,512 kilometers of drains, 3,054 kilometers of canals, and 575 kilometers of basin bank have been constructed in the provinces.

"The number of men called out on *corvée* has been reduced from 281,000 to 11,000 men.

"Imports have increased by over £ (E) 2,600,000, while, notwithstanding the enormous fall in the price of cotton and sugar, there has been only a slight falling off in the value of the exports.

"The quantity of salt sold has doubled, while the price has been reduced by close on 40 per cent.

"The tonnage of the Port of Alexandria has increased from 1,250,000 to 2,270,000.

"The amount of bonds outstanding on the market in 1881 was £(st)98,376,660; in 1897 it was £(st.)98,035,780, notwithstanding £(st.)13,219,000 of fresh debt raised to cover extraordinary expenditure, and £(st.)3,400,000 increase of capital due to conversion. The interest charge in 1881 was £(E)4,235,921; in 1897 it was £(E)3,908,684.

"The market price of 5 per cent. Privileged Debt in 1881 was £(st.)96¼; in 1897 the market price of the same debt converted into 3½ per cent. was £(st.)102.

"The 4 per cent. Unified Debt was at £(st.)71⅝ in 1881, and at £(st.)106½ in 1897.

"The amount of debt per head of population was in 1881 £(st.)14. 8s. 9d.; it is to-day £(st.)10.0s. 2d.

I have said nothing as yet of the remarkable man who, since

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1887, has held the chief place among the many eminent British officials to whom the present prosperity of Egypt is due. As British Minister-Plenipotentiary and Consul-General, Sir Evelyn Baring, Lord Cromer, has, gifted with what Sir Alfred Milner calls his "most striking feature—a singular combination of strength and forbearance," piloted Egypt with safety and success not merely through the obstacles of Oriental conservatism and sloth, but past all the shoals and quicksands which threaten to engulf any country which every Great Power in Europe seeks to control. "It would be difficult," says Milner, "to overestimate what the work of England in Egypt owes to the sagacity, fortitude, and patience of the British Minister. . . . The contrast between Egypt to-day and Egypt as he found it, the enhanced reputation of England in matters Egyptian, are the measure of the signal services he has rendered alike to his own country and to the country where he has laid the foundations of a lasting fame." This noble tribute was pronounced by one who was long Under Secretary for Finance in Egypt and now is Governor of the Cape Colony and High Commissioner for South Africa.

Owing to the well-known caution and timidity of capital, a fair test of the prosperity of a country is to mark how its government securities stand on the Stock Exchange. I sometimes think that the critics who deprecate the British administration of Egypt must either not be holders of Egyptian government securities or have sold out too soon, for no sensible investor would deny that that administration had conferred extraordinary benefits on Egypt when he found that his "Egyptian State Domain stock," which in 1878 he bought at 73, was to-day worth 106; his "Egyptian Unified Debt," which is 1881 he bought at 71 3-4, was to-day worth 109; his "Egyptian Government Guaranteed Loan," which in 1885 he bought at 95 1-2, was to-day worth 109; while his "Egyptian Government Preference" and "Daira" stocks, which in 1890 he bought at 91 and 99 1-4, respectively, were to-day worth 105 and 106. Nothing but the steady progress of Egypt under exceptionally able management could have led to such a rise in the value of Egyptian government securities.

While giving in this article due prominence to the administrative and reforming action of Britain in Egypt, I by no means overlook the services of the native and other officials who have so loyally and efficiently supported the British. Yet it is Britain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and British officials who are now responsible for Egypt before the bar of History. From Lord Cromer's luminous Report, dated Jan. 15, 1897, on the "Finances, Administration and Condition of Egypt, and the Progress of Reforms," I gather that while he accepts full responsibility for the safety, progress and well being of Egypt, its financial and general administration are mainly controlled, and its reform has been chiefly effected, by British officials acting with and under his Lordship. He treats of Egypt as a country committed to his care, and under the management of British officials, of whom he is chief. There is no sign and apparently no chance of the country's retrogression under his vigorous control; there is nothing but progress and prosperity to record.

For, if Egypt can boast of a great historic Past, she can also confidently look forward to a great economic Future, provided she secure a wise, honest, and energetic administration. Granted that one condition, and Egypt will eventually become one of the most prosperous countries in the world, her wealth, commerce and industry will increase, and her inhabitants will know happiness which their forefathers often sighed for but never possessed. But the administration must be wise, it must be honest, it must be energetic, it must be popular with the natives themselves. I have endeavored to prove that the present British administration can lay claim to all these attributes, and I have, however imperfectly, ventured to show what Britain has done for Egypt. Mr. Penfield's criticism, as coming from an American, nay, the "late United States Diplomatic Agent in Egypt," was all the more strange, as the American missions and other institutions in Egypt have profited so much by the law and order introduced into Egypt since 1882. I confidently appeal to the many Americans resident or travelling in Egypt, and would ask them whether, considering the peace and security they have enjoyed there since the British administration began, they see (like Mr. Penfield) "scant justification" for Britain's "continuing her sojourn in Egypt?"

RALPH RICHARDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REGULARS IN THE CIVIL WAR.

BY RUFUS FAIRCHILD ZOGBAUM.

WHEN the menacing storm clouds of war burst, and "red rebellion," with blazing torch and armed hand, struck at the life of the nation, all throughout the land, east, west and north, from sea coast to prairie, from town and village, from shop and farm, from the schoolhouse itself, wave on wave, like a mighty river, ever "coming, Father Abraham, ten hundred thousand more," the manhood and youth of the country poured forth to its defense. Four long years of war transformed the raw volunteer recruit of '61 into the tried and hardy volunteer veteran of '65, as ore that passes through the ordeal of fire and forge turns to tempered steel, and the American citizen-soldier of that time has few if any peers in the history of the world. But it is not to his disparagement to say that there already stood under the colors a body of experienced and splendidly trained soldiery, who, had their strength been in comparison with their magnificent courage and disciplined devotion to duty, would have spared the nation the sacrifice of thousands of lives and millions of treasure.

Less than fourteen thousand strong, then, as now, inadequate in point of numbers for the duties imposed upon it, the outbreak of hostilities between the States found the regular army scattered in small detachments over a vast territory, the cavalry and infantry almost constantly in conflict with the savage foe of advancing civilization, the artillery covering with a thin and broken line the long extent of sea coast on two oceans. Imbued with an *esprit de corps* born of the wars of three-fourths of a century, bound together by common share in the dangers and vicissitudes of the life they led, the soldiers of the "Old Army" formed a distinct class by themselves, representing, in its composition, traditions and history, the incarnation of the spirit of respect for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law and order that forms the foundation of the republic. Proud and self-reliant, they knew no other life but that which duty called on them to live, and to them the flag they bore was the emblem of the honor of the country, the army and the regiment.

So it was when the grand old Third Infantry, under orders to evacuate Texas, was halted on its march to the coast, and the intimation given to it that it would be well to march around the city of San Antonio for fear of the consequences that might ensue, in the excited state of the community, should the column attempt to pass through the town. All the fiery pride of the gallant "Buff Sticks"* burst into flame at the insult. What! "Sneak around by the by-ways when the main road was open!" Hide the colors in a box, the colors that had followed "Mad Anthony Wayne," that had flaunted defiantly in the faces of Pakenham's veteran red coats at New Orleans! Put away the starred ensign that had flashed triumphant through the smoke of Palo Alto, Resaca de la Palma, and Monterey, that had crowned the heights of Cerro Gordo, and waved over the assaulting columns at Churubusco, Molino del Rey, Chapultepec, and Mexico! Fall in! To your posts, gentlemen! Full dress shall be the uniform of the day. And with colors floating proudly, band playing, with gold epaulettes and polished brass shoulder scales glistening, and bright bayonets flashing back the sun's rays, the regiment marches straight through the town in the face of the gathering crowds of angry people. So it was when the Second Cavalry—now the Fifth—riding away northward from the Texan frontier, turned back in its march at the call for help of their former friends, now their enemies, but yet their fellow countrymen, to strike and disperse the savage bands swooping down upon the settlements the regiment had shielded for so many years. So it was, too, when many of the enlisted men of detachments, overpowered or basely surrendered during the evacuation, escaped from their captors, and making their way by devious routes, some of them through Mexico, to New York, reported themselves at headquarters there "present and ready for duty." While it is true that many of the commissioned officers, Southern born, taught from infancy to believe that allegiance to the State was paramount to allegiance to the Union, yielding to pressure from families and friends, threw up their commissions and espoused the cause of

* "Buff Sticks" was a nickname given to the regiment in the Mexican War.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Confederacy, the great mass of their comrades kept faith with the nation, and the enlisted force to a man remained true to the colors it had sworn to defend. So it was, finally, that Sumter's puny garrison, deserted and abandoned to its fate by those in authority, but staunch and undismayed, struck defiantly back at the encircling ring of assailants in defense of the principles of the Constitution and for the honor of the flag and the army.

All the world knows the story of what followed. Throughout the entire South the people rose in arms, and the wave of rebellion was almost lapping the steps of the Capitol. The whole country was ablaze with the fire of patriotism, and the land resounded with the tread of marching thousands hastening to the now "inevitable conflict." Then came First Bull Run, where, interposing its small but invincible front between the fleeing crowd of panic stricken fugitives and the victorious foe, a little band of regulars checked the pursuit, and saved what had been called an army. So from the beginning their "disciplined courage" rose superior to misfortune and danger, and again and again on one bloody field after another they wrested victory from disaster and won honor and glory in the very face of defeat.

Differing only in the locality of the fields of their glory, alike in the record of their heroism, the story of one body of these men is the story of all, and in the history of the war there are no brighter pages than those which tell of the "Regular Brigade" of the Army of the Cumberland and of that "incomparable infantry" of the Second Division, Fifth Corps, Army of the Potomac—"Sykes' Regulars."

On the organization of the Fifth Corps in the spring of 1862, the troops of the regular army composing the first and second brigades of the second division consisted of the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth and Tenth regiments and one battalion each of the Eleventh, Twelfth, Fourteenth and Seventeenth United States infantry *. The batteries attached to the division were L and M of the Fifth and I of the First regiments of artillery. The third brigade was composed of volunteer troops, the Fifth New York—Duryea's Zouaves, one of the most renowned and distinguished volunteer regiments of the Army of the Potomac—the Tenth New York and the First Connecticut. The latter two regiments

* Subsequently added to by battalions of the 7th and 19th infantry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were subsequently removed and the One Hundred and Fortieth and One Hundred and Forty-sixth New York attached in their place. Brigadier General George Sykes, U. S. army, commanded the division. Of the "regular" regiments the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh and Tenth were old regiments, the others were battalions of eight companies each of the new regiments authorized in 1861 by the act of Congress increasing the regular establishment. In his history of the Fifth Corps Colonel W. H. Powell says: "Around the standards of the old regiments were clustered all the traditions of the country's wars—a sacred trust they guarded well on every field." They were tried men, these splendid veterans, while in the new regiments most of the men and many of the officers were now to face the "dread ordeal of battle" for the first time. "When one of the newly organized battalions of the Regular Brigade of the Army of the Potomac reported to Colonel Buchanan, he said to its commander: 'Sir, your men look like volunteers!' The reply was: 'That is just what they are.' The veteran martinet rejoined: 'I will make them regulars'—and he did!" So writes Colonel Anderson in his historical sketch of the Fourteenth Infantry. Association with their veteran comrades in arms, precept, example and environment, added to their natural intelligence and aptitude, soon imbued these troops with the discipline and spirit of the older regiments. "They act like mustangs, but they fight like men," was the comment of an old officer watching one of these battalions moving forward to the attack, cheering loudly, under the devastating fire of the enemy.

The glory of the achievements of the regular batteries—field and horse artillery—shines resplendent through the smoke of four years of battle. Distributed through all the armies of the Union the batteries of the regular line were practically independent commands, the regimental formations existing more as a matter of form than as actual organizations. As with the infantry and cavalry, the superior officers of artillery held high commissions in the volunteer forces, and the command of batteries fell to younger officers, by whose names, written in characters of fame in the chronicles of the war, they will be known while the thunder of their guns reverberates down through the past from nearly every field of contest throughout the length and breadth of the land, from the first defiant shot from Sumter to the last

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gun aimed at the last army of the Confederacy.* Wherever the fire was hottest the regular batteries were conspicuous, and their splendid drill and organization, "their habitual devotion," inspired the entire Union artillery with a spirit of emulation and confidence worthy of the "full genius of the arm."

In the tragedies of the Seven Days' battles on the Peninsula "Sykes' Regulars" played a leading rôle; their positions on more than one field of that thrilling campaign of victory in defeat were marked in stubborn lines of fire and blood, and Gaines's Mill and Malvern stand at the beginning of their proud record in the Army of the Potomac.

During the initial attack of the Confederates at Gaines's Mill Sykes' division bore the brunt of the fight against overwhelming numbers. "With twenty-six regiments, four battalions and three batteries, General Hill, though his brave men had done all that any soldiers could do, had failed to carry the line that was held by nine regiments (finally increased to eleven), three battalions and two batteries."† Eleven out of the sixteen organizations composing this line consisted of regular troops, and the returns of their losses show how desperate was their resistance to the onslaughts of the gallant enemy. As the fight progressed the entire Fifth Corps became engaged, struggling obstinately against the repeated attacks of the Confederates who hurled forth the masses of their choicest and bravest troops under the command of such leaders as Jackson, Longstreet, D. H. and A. P. Hill and Ewell. That splendid soldier, Fitz-John Porter, stood like a lion at bay, his repeated calls for reinforcements unanswered until late in the afternoon, when Slocum's division arrived on the field too late to retrieve the fortunes of the day. Decimated, worn out by long hours of continuous fighting, the Union line, sturdily resisting, but forced back by preponderance of numbers, gave way under the final attack of the Confederates. "The well disciplined Federals continued in retreat to fight with stubborn resistance," reported General Jackson, so stubbornly and with such a determined and valiant front that the Confederate general, Whiting, was compelled, even in the flush of victory, to call on Longstreet for reinforcements.

* The garrison of Fort Sumter at the time of the bombardment was composed of detachments from the First Artillery. A battery of the same regiment fired the last cannon shot of the war from the Union side.

† Powell's *History of the Fifth Corps*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was at this moment that five troops of the Fifth Cavalry, in gallant and unquestioning obedience to orders, swept down upon the advancing hosts of the enemy in a wild and desperate charge, second to none in the annals of warfare.

"The sun had sunk below the horizon, the heavy smoke of battle was hanging thick over the field, and the last attack of the enemy had been made and won. Only the cavalry and a part of the artillery remained on this part of the field. A brigade of Texans, broken by their long advance, under the lead of the hardest fighter in all the Southern armies, came running on with wild yells, and they were a hundred yards from the guns. It was then that the cavalry commander ordered Capt. Charles J. Whiting, with his regiment, to the charge. No one had blundered; it was the supreme moment for cavalry, the opportunity that comes so seldom on the modern field of war, the test of discipline, hardihood and nerve. Right well was the task performed. The 220 troopers of the Fifth Cavalry struck Longstreet's veterans square in the face. Whiting, his horse killed under him, fell stunned at the feet of the Fourth Texas Infantry, Chambliss was torn almost to pieces with six wounds. Sweet was killed. Only one of the other officers was unwounded. Unsupported and almost without officers the troopers were stopped by the woods of the creek bottom, returned, reformed, and were soon after opposed to the enemy in covering the retreat of the Federal Army. Two days later the same troops were engaged at Savage Station. The guns which were in condition to retire were saved. No action was ever more worthy of a poet's genius; no cavalry charge was ever ridden better or against more helpless odds of numbers. In other lands every survivor of Balaclava has been pensioned and decorated; the German nation will always delight over the record of its cavalry at Vionville and Mars-la-Tour, and the great Chancellor was never so proud as when he embraced his sons who rode in the ranks on that day; the memory of the sacrifice of the French cavalry at Sedan is still a balm for many wounds. But while Cardigan, Bredow and Gallifet, each in his own land received every honor, it is strange to relate that Whiting was dismissed for alleged disloyalty a few months after Gaines's Mill, reinstated after the war, and mustered out of service at the consolidation in 1870.*

Proudly defiant, slowly contesting the field of battle foot by foot, more dangerous in defeat than in the full tide of success, and never for a moment losing their cohesion or yielding to coward panic, Sykes' sturdy infantry hung like bulldogs on the flanks of their batteries, and aided in the repulse of repeated and desperate attacks upon them of a brave enemy, flushed with triumph and eager to bear away the guns as trophies of their victory. The famous "Second" retiring, as ordered, in line of battle, colors flying, halted and turned on the enemy, driving him back and saving a disabled battery. The loss of this regiment was one hundred and forty-eight out of an effective force

* Capt. Eben Swift, Fifth Cavalry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of four hundred and forty-six! As night fell the ceaseless roll of musketry over on Sykes' right told how the Fourth Infantry was covering the retirement of Weed with his guns. The Confederates poured out from the woods on all sides, but the disciplined regulars, seizing and valiantly holding every point of vantage, facing by wings at right angles to their line, and by sheer pluck and endurance hurling back the pursuers on their flanks, kept the hostile battalions at bay until their comrades were well on the way to safety, then slowly fell back in the approaching gloom of night to the banks of the Chickahominy. Like watch-dogs, all night they lay between their comrades and the foe, until at daylight they sullenly and reluctantly crossed the river, destroying the bridge on their way, the last of the Federal forces to pass the Chickahominy.

Gaines's Mill was the first battle for the Twelfth and Fourteenth. In his report of the action the brigade commander, Col. Buchanan, states that: "The two old regiments, the Third and Fourth, maintained their previous reputation, and the new battalions, the Twelfth and Fourteenth, earned one for themselves." Referring to the charge made by the last named, he says that "they advanced in as handsome a line of battle as I ever saw on drill." Their losses were very heavy, the Twelfth losing two hundred and twelve out of a total of four hundred and seventy, the loss of the Fourteenth, by a curious coincidence, being identical with that of the sister regiment.

The limits of this article forbid more than brief mention of the services of the brave men of Sykes' Division in all the desperate fighting on every field from Gaines's Mill to Gettysburg. Malvern, Manassas (Second Bull Run), Sharpsburg, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville and Gettysburg all bear witness to the prowess of the regulars, their sacrifices, their discipline and fortitude, their steadiness under conditions of dismay and panic, their enthusiasm and bravery in attack, their stubborn and courageous resistance in retreat. These qualities shone forth conspicuously on the evening of the defeat of Pope's army at Second Bull Run, where once again, as in the battle on the same field the year before, the regulars stood at bay between the advancing hosts of the enemy and the torn and shattered columns of the Federal forces.

As when the tides of the ocean, rolling resistlessly onward in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great grey billows, are dashed back in broken spray and spume as they rush upon a rock-bound coast, so the fierce grey legions of Longstreet and Jackson, those peerless fighters of the Lost Cause, pressed onward in all their strength only to recoil again and again in angry discomfiture from the rock-strong, blue front of Sykes' men. Not until vastly outnumbered, the supply of ammunition nearly exhausted, did the movement of retreat begin, and then only on the receipt of orders to retire. Quietly and without confusion, in lines "as if on parade," closing up as the shot of the enemy tore gaps in their ranks, halting every few yards, facing about and delivering their fire by wings, in echelon of regiments in splendid order they moved gradually to the rear until night put an end to the battle, and the line of the army's retreat over the historical stone bridge had been saved. On the road to Centreville that night was all the dismay and disorder of a defeated army in full retreat. Sutler's wagons, guns, caissons poured in a tumultuous mass along the highway, mingled with them ambulances with their wretched loads of maimed and suffering humanity. Regiments, disorganized and in disarray, filled the fields on all sides, cavalry, infantry, and artillery struggling onward in apparently inextricable confusion, wet and miserable in the now steadily falling rain, while many, utterly exhausted, threw themselves on the sodden ground in hopeless despondency and discouragement. Filing in a compact column on to the Centreville turnpike, a body of troops, infantry and artillery, pushed its way steadily and resistlessly through the throngs of fugitives, halting or advancing as directed, in disciplined and orderly silence, broken only by the commands of the officers and the cadenced tramp of its march. From a group, dimly visible by the roadside through the darkening shadows of night the figure of a mounted officer detached itself, moving slowly out into the road, and an authoritative voice challenged: "What troops are these?" "Sykes' Regulars, sir!" came the prompt answer from the head of the gloom-enveloped column. Up went hand to hat brim as the officer bared his head to the storm in salute to the passing column. "They saved the army," he said; then in a voice hoarse with emotion General McDowell added the fervent words: "God bless the Regulars!"

An interesting illustration of the self-control and training of these men is given by an incident which occurred when McClel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lan, peremptorily relieved from the command of the Army of the Potomac, rode through its ranks in his farewell review of the army he had created. Probably no other commander of that splendid force ever possessed the personal love and devotion of the soldiers in the same degree as McClellan, and the enforced leavetaking between himself and his men gave occasion to a scene of ardent enthusiasm bordering on confusion as he rode along the wildly cheering lines of soldiers drawn up in review order until he reached the right of the line of the regular division. Here, with one simultaneous crash of wood and polished steel the long blue line came to the "present," and the battle-torn standards bowed gracefully forward in salute. An eye witness, describing the scene, says: "Who could have believed that these men, with their bronzed visages, their battle-scarred bodies and their proud, soldierly bearing, could weep? Yet some of them did." But their habits of discipline, their military pride and trained stoicism held the same stern sway over them in this moment as at all other times. Not a murmur, not a cheer broke from the serried front. "Silent as the grave" this war-worn soldiery stood motionless in martial salute to their beloved chief passing along their lines for the last time.

With their heroic stand at Manassas the Regulars of the Army of the Potomac reached the pinnacle of their glory. From that time on through the campaigns that followed they bore their full share, becoming so reduced in numbers that the splendid division that had so proudly and gallantly reared its steel fringed front at Gaines's Mill had become but a shadow of its former self at Gettysburg. Already in February, 1863, many of the companies had lost so heavily that their organizations were broken up, and what was left of the men assigned to other companies. Gen. Sykes being placed at the head of the Fifth Corps, the command of the Regular division fell to Gen. Romeyn B. Ayres, and under him proof was given once more of the magnificent morale of the troops on the sanguinary field of Gettysburg. Held in reserve with the rest of the Fifth Corps the two small brigades of now only fifty-seven companies, amounting in the aggregate to less than two thousand men, did not go into action until the disaster to the Third Corps, when their thinned and depleted ranks flung themselves desperately upon the triumphant Confederates, once again interposing themselves between their retreating comrades

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the volunteers and the pursuing enemy. Striking the Confederates in flank Ayres rolled them back upon themselves, and drove them in confusion from his front. But his enemies were too strong for him; outflanking him and gathering in his rear they poured volley after volley into his battalions, mowing the men down like blades of grass before the scythe. And now occurred an exhibition of indomitable pluck and determined and sagacious courage such as only highly trained and disciplined troops could show. Facing about, the little division forced its way slowly back again. The roar of musketry was so incessant that the words of command could scarcely be heard. Men were falling by hundreds, but the veteran lines steadily filled the gaps, answering blow with blow as they pressed on firmly, enveloped in a perfect hell of fire and death. The color staff of the Second is shot in two, the flag falling into the hands of the bearer. In the Seventh every second man is killed or wounded. The Tenth suffers a loss of sixty per cent. of its officers and over fifty-four per cent. of the enlisted men in a few moments. But there was no panic, no confusion, "not a single man left the ranks, and they allowed themselves to be more than decimated without flinching," until the hill was reached again, and they reformed their shattered lines in their old position, leaving behind them, in a long and ghastly trail of dead and wounded, eight hundred and twenty-nine of the nineteen hundred and eighty that had so gallantly advanced to the attack only a short time before. Was there ever a more heroic military sacrifice?

The rest of the story is soon told. Grant took but a few battered battalions with him the following spring, all that were left of "Sykes' Regulars." Too few in numbers now to exercise much influence on the fortunes of the army, they maintained the same undaunted front all through the carnage of that dreadful summer, fighting with the same distinguished valor, true to the proud traditions of their service to the very bitter end. To recruit their diminished ranks was practically impossible. States and counties paid enormous bounties to volunteers, a hundred influences combined to make that service attractive to the great mass of the recruits; and, actually worn out in the conflict, the regiments—some of them so depleted as to aggregate little more than the number allowed for a single company—were withdrawn from the field.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their deeds emblazoned on the pages of history, sung of in impassioned verse by poets, their battles and victories, their final defeat and death perpetuated with all the genius of the painter's art, there stands in the story of the wars of another land, of another army, the record of a corps of soldiers to this day and for coming generations the pride and glory of their countrymen. Veterans selected for their aptitude for the profession of arms, physically superior, wearing a distinctive uniform and enjoying special privileges, splendidly armed and equipped, these magnificent troops obeyed but the will of one man in blind and disciplined devotion, yielding up their lives in the final hopeless struggle with the cry of "*Vive l'Empereur*" upon their lips. In the story of the fierce and sanguinary contests of the rebellion is told the tale of another corps of soldiers, wearing no distinguishing uniform, enjoying no special privileges, but equalled by few and surpassed by none in the history of wars, and as stood the Imperial Guard to the armies of France, so in blind devotion to duty and in trained and disciplined valor stood the line of the regular army, cavalry, artillery and infantry, to the armies of the Union. But here the comparison ends. Almost lost sight of in the overwhelming masses of the volunteers, neglected by Congress, and by the press, their superior officers absent with volunteer troops, their regiments commanded by captains and lieutenants, they wasted away under the pitiless fire of war and the ungrateful neglect of their countrymen, until little was left to the rank and file of the regular army but the glory of their deeds and the consciousness, in the breasts of the survivors, of duty well and faithfully done.

RUFUS FAIRCHILD ZOGBAUM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION: SOME CONSTITUTIONAL COMPARISONS.

BY JOHN W. RUSSELL.

NEVER have the framers of a constitution profited by so rich an experience as have the Australian statesmen who finished their deliberations at Melbourne a few months ago, and submitted the result to the popular vote of the different colonies. The instrument of government fashioned by their skill and patience ought to be free, one would suppose, from the propositions of the doctrinaire as well as the limitations imposed by the exclusive study of one model. Besides the constitution of the mother country, they had before them the record of the practical working of the American, Canadian and Swiss federal systems, as well as that of the German Empire. In solidity and complexity of structure these systems surpassed all previous examples of federal government, and two of them had special claims upon the attention of Australian legislators, who had little reason to go beyond the constitutions of the United States, Canada and the Swiss Republic for the necessary guidance and instruction. These summed up the best that had been thought and done to federalize democracy, and their historic and structural differences allowed a catholic choice of material.

Far more difficult was the task that confronted the statesmen of the Philadelphia Convention in 1787, or that which engaged the energies of the pioneers of Canadian Confederation. In both cases the territorial area and the diversity of interests were greater than had ever been embraced under a federal government, and in both there were disturbing causes severely trying to the resources of the most experienced judgment. In the former case the experiment was made after the emergence of a group of colonies from a prolonged and sanguinary war of insurrection;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the latter, it was somewhat hastily resorted to as a refuge from dangers which seemed imminent, and under prejudices which biassed political deliberation. But if the United States and Canada came into federal being under stress, the calm of unforced development has been the lot of Australia. Not a battle has been fought, nor a single shot fired, in the course of progress whose results are so remarkable and rich in promise. The unchecked experimentation of the separate colonies, which almost aspired to test the millennial claims of the new theories of social reconstruction, has been largely replaced by the concept of continental unity and the wider outlook which accompanies it.

It has been said that little originality can be claimed for this latest experiment in constitution building, and that both trend and goal had been unmistakably revealed by expediency as well as by shining political examples. It is hardly necessary to discuss the question of comparative originality in the case of a people who inherit a racial instinct for self-government, and who, if latest in the order of time, may claim an original use of the lessons of experience. The eulogies pronounced upon the Constitution of the United States have been largely inspired by its position of initiative, as a federation under new and untried conditions; the strength and size of the structure bespoke the daring wisdom of the architects. They patterned chiefly from British and colonial models, but they ventured much without the sanction of any precedent. In like manner the Canadian framers had new problems to solve, although to a certain extent they copied the Constitution of the United States. They had to devise a federation within that Empire which their American prototypes had cast off; they had a triple set of political powers to consider, while the convention at Philadelphia had only two. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the incomparable vantage ground from which the Australian statesmen could see where and why their federating predecessors had in some respects been mistaken. Careful in their study of the American and Canadian constitutions, intent and plan were compared with result in the history of their practical working, and the necessary imitations, omissions and variations were made in the Australian system.

The Australian people have not been suddenly enthusiastic in support of federation, although in parliamentary circles the idea has long been familiar. Practical progress thus far has de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pended upon the necessity of communicating to the people the views and beliefs which had almost become axiomatic with some of their ablest leaders. As far back as 1849 a committee of the Imperial Privy Council, acting in conformity with the best Australian opinion, advised the formation of Victoria into a separate colony, and at the same time favored the creation of a general assembly to legislate on intercolonial subjects. There was strong opposition to any imperial enactment embodying these recommendations, but the movement went on in the discussions of deliberative bodies, formal and informal, and its progress was registered in the reports of select committees and royal commissioners. Public men saw the trend of events, and leavened parliamentary discussion with the desirability and high promise of the coming change. Influences from without quickened the movement that was progressing from within, and in 1883 the perception of French and German designs in the Pacific helped to efface the differences which had weakened the feeling for union. The result was the Federal Council Act, providing for a federal legislature of limited powers, and extending only to such colonies as chose to come under its authority. It was strongly opposed by Sir Henry Parkes, who had at first looked favorably upon the project, and it was felt that the measure was only preparatory.

Major-General Edwards' report for 1889, urging the necessity of federation from a military point of view, made salient the features of a situation which called for a remedy. In New South Wales, Sir Henry Parkes and his friends took advantage of the report to press the claims of federation, and the political leaders of the other colonies were urged to fall in line with the movement. An intercolonial conference held in Melbourne, in 1890, resulted in the Sydney Convention of 1891, composed of delegates elected by the parliaments of the different colonies, and authorized to frame an adequate scheme for a federal constitution. The Commonwealth Bill was the result; but its reception showed comparative apathy on the part of the colonial electorates. There seemed to be no strong popular impulse in favor of it, except in a few places, and no enthusiasm spread from these. The friends of the bill claimed that the great mass of voters had not been taken into the confidence of the parliamentary leaders, and they forthwith set about to remedy the defect. Federation leagues

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and other voluntary, unofficial public bodies met in the different colonies to discuss the situation; and it was agreed that if a new convention, with delegates elected by popular suffrage instead of by the parliaments, were held, and efficient legal machinery provided for the whole constitutional process, from the election of delegates up to the transmission of the completed instrument to the imperial authorities for final enactment into law, there would be neither a lack of popular support nor a long delay in attaining the completed result.

These ideas found a voice at the Corowa Convention of 1893, where Dr. Quick procured the passage of resolutions in favor of a federal enabling act to be passed by the parliaments of the different colonies. New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, and finally Western Australia (though not in favor of delegates elected by the people) passed the act, under whose provisions the final convention has been held. It should be borne in mind that the Commonwealth Bill of 1898 differs somewhat from that drafted by the Sydney Convention of seven years ago, and that the more democratic character of the present measure only reflects the political impulse which determined the popular election of the delegates. Between 1891 and 1897 federation became more truly a popular question, and the different electorates shared, in the revived movement, the initiative which had formerly rested with their leaders in Parliament. Such, in brief outline, is the history of the federation question, and whether the Commonwealth Bill is or is not ratified by the people, it is unlikely that its provisions will be materially changed so long as it is a living issue.*

The new constitution provides for a federation under the British Crown, and composed of the colonies of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia. The Federal Legislature consists of the Queen, represented by a Governor-General; a Senate, in which each colony, henceforth to be known as a State, is to be equally represented by members directly elected by popular vote; and a House of Representatives whose members will be in proportion to population. There will be a Federal Supreme Court, whose judges will hold office during good behavior. The principle of the division of

* Since the above was written Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia have voted for federation, thus ensuring the establishment of the new constitution, at least so far as the three colonies that supported it are concerned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislative power between the federation and the States is the same as that of the American Republic, the States retaining all powers except such as are expressly given to the federation. The House of Representatives has the power of originating money bills, which the Senate may accept or reject, but may not amend. An important safeguard against deadlock between House and Senate has been made by a clause which provides for simultaneous dissolution to be followed, in the event of continued disagreement, by a joint session of both Houses, when a two-thirds majority shall decide the passing of the bill in dispute. Among the subjects exclusively within the scope of federal legislation are commercial relations with other countries and among the several States, customs and excise, posts and telegraphs, military and naval defence, navigation and shipping, banking and the currency, marriage and divorce. The difficult question of the financial relations of the States was referred to a special committee whose report has been largely incorporated in the constitution, which provides that a uniform customs tariff shall be established for the federation within two years. Trade within the borders of this tariff is to be absolutely free, and the just contribution of each State to the federal revenue is to be determined by careful investigation. Constitutional amendments require a majority of the Senate and House of Representatives, after which they must be submitted to conventions elected by the people of the several States, and approved by a majority of such conventions. The people of the States whose conventions so approve must also be a majority of the people of the Commonwealth. An amendment diminishing the proportionate representation of any State in either House of the Federal Legislature shall not become law without the consent of such State.

It is not easy to say whether the American or the Canadian constitution has been more closely copied. If the former has been the chief model in the formal statement of certain principles recognized as federal, the latter has been imitated in the introduction of cabinet or responsible government, thus establishing the rule of British constitutional usage in the exercise of executive power and the conduct of legislation—a principle of growth whose processes and results are unwritten law. That the new nation is not to be an independent republic, but the Commonwealth of Australia under the British Crown, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubtless owing to the peaceful political development which was repugnant, from the standpoint of interest as well as of racial affiliation, to a separation from the mother country. The relation of a dependency which is more nominal than real, and which may look forward to a larger and final federation in an equal union, has not been found incompatible with a national life and dignity.

Some of the constitutional features in which the new federation differs from the American and Canadian are of more than ordinary interest. The scope of federal executive power is substantially the same as in the Dominion of Canada, though time may develop some unexpected divergences. In the Australian system the relation between the federal executive and the Governors of the States will be different from that which obtains in the Dominion. In the latter, the executive heads of the different Provinces are appointed by the Governor-General in Council—that is to say, by the federal prime minister of the day. They may at any time be dismissed from office by the same authority for cause assigned, and provincial legislation is likewise subject to a federal veto. But in Australia each State will appoint its Governor, and State legislation will not be subject to either an imperial or a federal veto.

The powers of the Supreme Court are a close approximation to those of the Supreme Court of Canada. It is, of course, designed to be the guardian of the constitution, whose provisions it will interpret. It will also have jurisdiction in cases arising under federal legislation and in inter-State cases, as well as appeals from State courts. It cannot be strictly called, like the Supreme Court of the United States, a tribunal of final resort, because its powers are subject to alteration by parliament, and the right to appeal from its decisions to the Queen in Council further restricts its jurisdiction. The federal legislature may define or custom may establish classes of cases on which its decision may be considered final, so that it may be difficult to obtain leave to appeal therefrom; but there is the constitutional provision, overriding everything to the contrary, that the Queen in Council may in any case in which the public interests of the Commonwealth, or of any State, or of any other part of the Queen's dominions are concerned, grant leave to appeal from any judgment of the Supreme Court of Australia. The granting of such leave is dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cretionary, and judging by Canadian experience it will prove to be without friction. The suggestive fact is that the Australian States, though relatively of greater importance than the Provinces in the Canadian system, have shown no jealousy of any judicial interpretation of their rights. The thread of connection runs from the State courts up to the throne; contests over questions of greater or less importance may proceed in an ascending series of judicial determinations up to the Privy Council; and by these provisions, which would seem to break in upon the consistency of separate spheres of federal and State sovereignty, and to go beyond them both, the people of Australia have shown their confidence in the integrity of the bench. Apart from the purely legal view, the result cannot but tighten the political bond with the mother country.

The constitution of the Senate is a departure from the usual form of the upper house in the British and colonial parliaments. Like the Senate of the United States, it stands consistently for the federal principle, and the States are therefore equally represented in it. There is no such marked disparity in their populations as that which allows the votes of Nevada and New York to neutralize each other. For the choice of senators by the State legislatures, as established by the Sydney Convention of 1891, direct popular election has been substituted. It is quite evident that the members of the Melbourne Convention made a careful study of the Canadian, American and Swiss senates with special reference to the inconsistencies and defects of the first two. The influential minority of reformers, who have long been satisfied that United States senators should be elected by popular vote, will regard the Australian experiment with deep satisfaction, nor will they fail to attribute the result partly to their own persistent efforts. Between 1891 and 1897 resolutions in favor of this change, involving an amendment of the Constitution, passed the House of Representatives at Washington and were reported favorably in the Senate. Only a few weeks ago the House passed another similar resolution by a practically unanimous vote of 184 to 11. The arguments in the support of these resolutions are well known by forcible repetition. The corrupt methods by which an undue number of rich men have become senators, the tedious and bitter contests in certain cases, the cynical despotism of the "boss," the gerrymandering of senatorial and represent-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ative districts by State legislatures, the narrowing of political issues by the personal interests of senators seeking election—all these abuses have been set forth not without benefit to those who wished to avert similar evils in Australia. Fearing their probable recurrence in the new federation, its framers have in effect declared that an indirect choice of senators is undemocratic; they have recorded their disbelief in a vicarious exercise of the individual franchise; they did not think that the State legislatures could act with a more trained discretion than the people themselves, or rather they held that the people's instinct for the right men could supply the public service better than could party management in a State legislature of variable complexion.

The Canadian Senate, an imitation of the House of Lords so far as unsuitable conditions would allow, was evidently regarded by the Australian statesmen as something to avoid imitating. It was, of course, looked upon as undemocratic both in principle and practice, and the apportionment of members was deemed a plain violation of the federal principle of equal representation. In the Confederation Act the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were counted as one and given an equal representation with Ontario and Quebec; there was a creation of three equal groups, but no equality in the Provinces themselves, as was shown on the subsequent admission of Manitoba and British Columbia.

The undemocratic character of the chamber may be accounted for to some extent by the strong temper and exciting conditions under which the Canadian framers matured their plans. Their deliberations were made exigent by the Civil War, which to them conveyed a lesson of the danger of State rights. Besides, they remembered the unsatisfactory experience with the elective Legislative Council which existed for some years prior to Confederation. Under the circumstances it is not strange that they were disposed to belittle and distrust an upper house patterned after that of the neighboring republic, and although they saw that a federal constitution was inevitable, they put as much of the British leaven in it as they possibly could. The opening words of the preamble to the British North America Act are: "Whereas the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Kingdom." The last clause seems inconsistent, unless very freely interpreted, but if justifiable at all, it is by the provisions relating to the Senate. An irresponsible body, fixed in number and nominated for life by a Governor-General, who is advised by a party leader, is the constitutional anomaly of Canada, and suggests Voltaire's witticism on the Holy Roman Empire. He said it was neither "Holy," nor "Roman," nor "Empire," but not with more truth than any one can say of the Dominion Senate, that it is neither federal, nor representative, nor democratic, although it has many excellent and able men among its members. The hereditary principle is lacking, because the structure of Canadian society put that out of the question; but, on the other hand, it has no fear, like the House of Lords, of a sufficient increase in membership to ensure the passage of a popular measure toward which it may be recalcitrant or reactionary. Only saving common sense and a prudent regard for public opinion can prevent it from the obstruction of public business. By virtue of its constitutional powers it could almost wreck the legislation of a session, if partisanship were strong enough to prompt such a course; but its only Nemesis is a constitutional amendment.

Experience alone will determine whether the Australian upper house will, like that of England and Canada, prove inferior to the lower in the contribution of its members to the interest and dignity of public life. In this respect the Senate of the United States has, in the estimation of some capable critics, of late years descended from its former high estate. The presence of members who have no exceptional ability or real political importance, and the marked deterioration in eloquence and argument as compared with the great days when Webster, Clay and Calhoun made memorable the debate of public questions, have been ascribed, as already intimated, largely to election by the State legislatures, especially in their later phase of control by a rigid party mechanism whose methods, quite removed from the prevision of true statesmanship, are concerned with the art of winning elections and distributing patronage. It is, perhaps, as much owing to this fact as to any other that so many men of character and ability have grown indifferent to the claims of political duty.

To the objection that a Senate directly elected by the people will not be less liable than the House of Representatives to im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pulsive action, or that it is not likely to have that discernment in legislative revision which is often supposed to distinguish the upper house in bi-cameral parliaments, the Australian statesmen have made answer by providing for the election of one-half of the members every third year. This, according to expert opinion, is calculated to prevent sudden and rash changes, without unduly retarding the passage of any law decisively favored by the people. Two classes of senators, elected at different times, are also less liable to reflect too thoroughly any passing phase of opinion.

The introduction of cabinet or responsible government in the new federation has been made under exceptional conditions. It is the most marked divergence from the system of the United States, and, with some reservations, the most important resemblance to that of the Dominion of Canada. The British House of Commons, in the course of its development as the embodiment of the popular principle, has drawn to itself the practical control of the executive and legislation, and the dependence of the Cabinet upon the majority in the House is the central fact in parliamentary government. But it implies a certain inferiority in the power of the House of Lords, and has been inveterately associated with the non-representative character of the latter. The question arises, how will the Australian cabinet system work when both Houses are directly elected by the people? If even at the present day in Great Britain and Canada responsible government is a principle whose force and direction are not always closely calculable, how much less so may it be when one of its historic elements is changed in this new experiment? Will an Australian ministry rest upon a majority in one House, or in both? The Commonwealth Bill does not specify; it declares in effect that the Governor-General shall be aided and advised by an executive council whose members shall be eligible to seats in either House. The rest is left to unwritten custom.

It seems difficult to reconcile the usual meaning of a "parliamentary session" with the prescribed duration of either House in the new federal legislature. In Great Britain and Canada those words signify the constitutional term of the House of Commons, and the expiry of that term marks the time for dissolution and the possible advent of a new ministry. The Australian House of Representatives is to be elected for three years, and if the custom of the mother country is to govern, popular confidence in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministry must be similarly tested by dissolution. The Senate need not be consulted, and either its importance must be lessened thereby or the traditional practice in cabinet government must be greatly modified. It seems improbable that the House of Representatives will consent to share the prerogatives inherited from its great original. It retains the power of the purse by the right to originate money bills, which the Senate cannot amend. The Governor-General can dissolve it; but he has no power to dissolve the Senate, and that is a restriction which is more than likely to have a marked influence in perpetuating cabinet government on customary lines, as it excludes the Senate from that direct appeal to the people which not only arises by effluxion of time, but is contingent on an executive act. It is difficult to see why the resulting verdict should not decide the fate of a ministry, independently of the Senate.

In the case of a party leader of strong personality and tenacious grip on the springs of political power, a few decisive precedents might determine this question. Suppose, for example, that during the opening years of federation there should appear on the scene a statesman equal in capacity to the late Sir John Macdonald, and who should wield in Australian politics a sway as continuous and masterful as that of the late Conservative leader in Dominion affairs. Sir John held the premiership for nineteen years, exclusive of his lease of power before Confederation. His last tenure of office was from 1878 to 1891 without interruption. If the first premier of Australia should be supported by a majority in the House of Representatives for that length of time, an adverse majority in the Senate would have some difficulty in displacing him. He would control legislation in the House during more than four terms, and in default of opposition from the Senate during the first term he could invoke such default in support of the right to hold power so long as he could retain his majority. All the presumptions of cabinet custom would be in his favor; he could dispute the claim of the Senate to a voice in determining the fate of a ministry which owed its existence to the House alone. And he could with consistency allege that the Senate, though elected by the people, did not represent the people as a whole, but only the States, as electoral districts with separate and possibly conflicting interests. If the hereditary principle of the House of Lords, or the nominee power which fills

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Canadian Senate, or the federalism of the Senate of the United States—if each of these is different from the principle which represents the collective will of the whole people expressed at one time, none of them, it might be argued, should be suffered to share that control of the executive which has so long depended upon the popular branch of the legislature.

The question of frequency in changes of the federal ministry is suggested in connection with the unenviable showing in the colonies. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia had ninety-six different cabinets in forty years. It is inconceivable that efficiency in federal administration could exist with such a kaleidoscopic shuffling as has marred the field of view in provincial politics. But there are reasons why this need not be expected. Political affairs will henceforth demand a broader outlook and compel wider issues. Many of the most contentious subjects of legislation will be left to State control. Ministries will not rise and fall, as they have in the past, on a petty question of accounts or some matter of merely municipal interest. New conditions rule, and it is warrantable to expect a more equable conduct of public administration when the national life shall call for a better trained and more responsible service. When that service is given, it will be moulded by the traditions of British parliamentary government. The "manners, virtue, freedom, power" which have been associated with those traditions in the mother country will not be absent from the political career of her youngest daughter nation.

JOHN W. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RESOURCES AND INDUSTRIES OF SPAIN.

BY EDWARD D. JONES.

THE country with which the United States is at present at war occupies eleven-thirteenths of the largest peninsula of Southern Europe. It has an area a little less than that of France or Germany, and a population about one-half that of France and a third of that of Germany. The relative size of the two combatants is as 1 to 4¼ in population, in area as 1 to 18½.

Though Spain forms a peninsula of Europe it is most effectively separated from the rest of the continent by the Pyrenees; an impassable chain of mountains which for one hundred and eighty miles is not even pierced by a wagon road. It is not without reason, therefore, that the inhabitants betray the characteristics of an insular civilization. It is true that the peninsula formation opens the land to the sea, and gives Spain one mile of shore for every seventy-two square miles of area. It is also true that the sea has been called "the road to freedom" and the "highway of commerce." But to develop commerce a coast-line is not sufficient. There must be a productive interior region and its highways must lead naturally outward and down to the sea. The interior of Spain is an elevated plateau, walled in by rugged mountains in such a manner that communication between the inland plains and the harbors on the coast is difficult to maintain.

Toward the west the Pyrenees are continued under the name of the Cantabrian Mountains and end in a rugged coast that reminds one of Brittany and western Ireland. From the eastern end of this range a succession of rugged highlands extends across Spain toward the southeast, coming in sight of the Mediterranean coast and running parallel with it from Valencia to Murcia. To the east of these mountains are the narrow tropical coast slopes of Valencia and Catalonia, and the river valley of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Ebro. To the west the main portion of Spain is cut into troughs by mountains which bear away in continuous chains toward Portugal. The Guadarrama, the principal of these rocky ridges, cuts Spain into two sections through the middle, separating the wheat-growing plains of Old Castile and Leon from the barren highlands of New Castile and the pastures of Estremadura. The southern border of the central plateau is marked by the Sierra Morena, while along the coast the Sierra Nevada runs in parallel course. The two latter mountain ranges inclose far-famed Andalusia, the valley of the Guadalquivir.

The impression which one obtains from a view of the outlines of Spain is that of massiveness. As has often been said by geographers, the country seems to repeat, in miniature, the interior highlands and compact outlines of the continent of Africa. It is a common saying in France that Africa begins with the Pyrenees. There is a lack of that delicate articulation of parts which is shown by Greece, and of the slender and symmetrical structure found in Italy.

As Irving years ago said, "Many are apt to picture Spain in their imaginations as a soft southern region decked out with all the luxuriant charms of voluptuous Italy. On the contrary, though there are exceptions in some of the maritime provinces, yet, for the greater part, it is a stern, melancholy country, with rugged mountains and long, naked, sweeping plains, destitute of trees, and invariably silent and lonesome, partaking of the savage and solitary character of Africa."

The general slope of the country is toward the southwest. The main rivers rise in the east and flow in long courses toward the west. Spain turns her back upon Europe and the Mediterranean, and looks toward Africa, whence came her first permanent civilization, and toward the countries west of the Atlantic, where she has dreamed her dream of empire.

Let us review the characteristics of the chief industrial districts of Spain, beginning with the northwest. The Cantabrian Mountains cut off the inland plains of northern Spain from abundant rainfall, and receive it for themselves and the short, steep valleys of their coast declivities. The abundant moisture produces the emerald meadows of Galicia and the Asturias, which are as famous in Spain as are those of Ireland, and of Cheshire in England. These regions support a butter and cheese industry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All root crops do well, and some beet sugar is here manufactured. Orchards are everywhere, and although the climate is too moist for the production of good wine, the cider is famous. Forests and rich pastures clothe the sides of the mountains and afford an export of timber and wool. In Asturias the mountains contain considerable supplies of iron ore, which are shipped out of the country, mainly in the ore, from Bilbao. This source of supply was, down to 1888, the only great rival of the Lake Superior region. Since that year the Spanish product has fallen off rapidly in amount and has deteriorated in quality. The west coast of Galicia contains the best harbors of Spain. The people are trained to seamanship by prosperous fisheries of tunny, sardines and oysters.

In the northeastern part of Spain, directly south of the Pyrenees, lies the valley of the Ebro River. In its upper course this river gathers its waters in a region of mountain forests and pastures. In its middle course there is a region deserted because of its lack of water. The devastation of forests and the lack of irrigation works account for large tracts of country that have become barren and bereft of population. On the coast of the Mediterranean, in Catalonia, is to be found the most enterprising of the peoples of Spain. Here are centered the textile industries, cotton being manufactured in the north, silk in the south. One-fifth of the wine product of Spain comes from the region around Tarragona.

Along the Mediterranean shore Spain presents a narrow ribbon of fertile, delightful country. The region is often called "The Garden of Spain," and its inhabitants are active and industrious. In the province of Valencia, from the city of the same name, to Alicante, garden follows close upon garden. Here are grown wheat, wine, raisins, oranges, dates and olives. In these regions irrigation is successfully practised. The greater part of the water of the short coast streams is thus employed. Little rain falls, and what does come is dreaded because of the violence of the storms and the damage done by floods to the irrigation reservoirs.

It is a great contrast to pass from these tropical shores to the wind-swept plains of interior Spain. The level country, inclosed by the Guadarrama and the Cantabrian Mountains, forms in the west an extensive wheat-growing region. Toward the east, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rainfall decreases, pasturage encroaches upon arable culture. In New Castile, on the south of the Guadarrama and in about the center of Spain, the political capital has been placed. The level country in which it has been dropped, as if by accident, is for the most part a waterless plain, swept in winter by the piercing winds from the naked mountains of the north, sweltering in summer under the effect of the sun's rays on bare rock and soil. The climate of Madrid has been tersely described by its inhabitants as "three months of winter and nine of hell."

The southwestern portion of the Spanish plateau comprising Estremadura is a broken mountainous country. Originally the land was protected by oak and chestnut forests in such a way as to make agriculture possible, while droves of pigs were fed upon mast. Shepherds found it necessary to bring their flocks into this region to avoid the rigorous winters of the interior highlands. The result has shown the inveterate hatred of the shepherd for the forest. Little by little this natural covering has been stripped away, the climate has been altered and the interests of other classes have been sacrificed to those of the sheep owners. Estremadura is now considered the most backward part of Spain. In the first place, the titled owners of the herds of sheep early secured special privileges, through the laws of the Maesta, much to the disadvantage of agriculture. The border warfare long carried on between Christian and Moor across this region seems to have fixed forever a sense of hopelessness and insecurity to brood over the thoughts of the people. Finally, Estremadura, lying, as it does, near to the western coast, has been again and again drained of its best blood and brains to equip expeditions for conquest in the Western world. Cortez, who came from this region, has been the local hero. Adventure thus became the tamest thing which could command the respect of ambitious youths. The peaceful arts, which would have created gardens and orchards, and the homely honest methods of gaining success which would have enriched the towns, have been neglected.

The descent from these regions to the valley of the Guadalquivir is marked by the Sierra Morena. They are a loosely jointed chain of mountains abounding in convenient passes for commerce. They are celebrated for their remarkably rich and varied supplies of mineral deposits. Lead and silver are found at Linares. The greatest deposit of quicksilver in the world is at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Almaden. An equally distinguished copper region is that of Rio Tinto. Coal also has been mined at Velmez and Espiel.

South of these mining centers is the fertile vale of Andalusia. It is a country of unexcelled climate, shielded by its mountain boundaries from excessive heat or cold. It possesses great possibilities as an agricultural and fruit growing region, but as yet it must be described as undeveloped. A chief check to its agriculture lies in the fact that the soil is in the possession of a few landlords who do not possess the skill of encouraging improvements. A semi-tropical flora exists throughout the valley below Cordova. At Seville much tobacco is grown and manufactured. As this country is fitted by its climate to compete with Cuba in the production of sugar and tobacco for the Spanish market, it has experienced great prosperity since the war with Cuba has eliminated a rival, and the war with the United States has cut off imports of American tobacco. In the lower river valley on the white chalk soils of the Jerez hills, near Cadiz, is the home of sherry, the "sack" of English convivial literature.

As can readily be seen, Spain is a country sharply divided into geographical and industrial regions of diverse character. Her whole industrial life is in so backward a condition that no great localization of industry has yet taken place.

The agriculture of Spain is throughout characterized by crude and expensive methods of operation. It is only of recent years that machinery has been imported in quantities. The government has established a number of model farms, but it is said that these have had little influence upon prevailing customs. Only a little over one-half of Spanish territory is classed as productive. This includes 26.5 per cent. of the total area of the country devoted to grain and vegetables, 13 per cent. to pastures, 8.7 per cent. standing in forests and underbrush, 2.5 per cent. in vineyards, 1.7 in olive orchards, besides 2.5 per cent. under irrigation. Wheat and barley are the chief grain crops in the plateau region, while in the higher mountains oats and rye are grown. A little buckwheat is produced in the mountains at the head of the Bay of Biscay, to provide a dish of local fame; some rice is grown on the coast plains of Valencia.

The agriculturist of Spain has not properly prized the two heritages which his environment indicates to have been the most valuable of his original possessions. He has wasted the forests, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he has neglected to properly preserve and employ the supplies of water at his hand. Agriculturally, Spain was probably in better condition when the Moors possessed it than it is now. Wherever irrigation has been tried it has produced remarkable results. It has been estimated that 4,440 square miles are irrigated. In Murcia the population was not long since calculated at 101 per square mile, while in the irrigated districts of that province it was 1,681. The reverse to this picture is found in the *despopulados* or deserts that disgrace Spain. One of these lies southeast of Valladolid; another stretches along the Mediterranean from Almeria to Alicante; a third is northeast of Granada, while the largest, the Aragon desert, crosses the Ebro valley at about the middle. Stunted shrubs and esparto grass are the products of these areas. When some years ago a commercial use was found for esparto grass it proved a boon to many Spanish communities, especially in Murcia, and provided a new and paying occupation.

It need not be said that Spain is a country of rough roads. There is, therefore, a large demand for pack animals. The chief centers for the rearing of horses mules, and asses are Badajoz, Cadiz, Toledo, Teruel, and Valencia. These are all mountainous regions, and, in addition to their production of pack animals, are centers for sheep raising. A country with its crops thinly spread and difficult of access must be a pastoral country, and must employ sheep and goats as reapers and mowers. So a wasteful and ignorant agriculture can employ the pig as a savings bank. The animal husbandry of Spain indicates these conditions. Little attention is paid to breeding. The animals look like those ridden by Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, while the merino is neglected in the land of its origin.

In the extent of its mineral resources Spain ranks as the first country of Europe. It possesses more gypsum than all the rest of the continent. Almaden produces quicksilver, while near it are soda and fine sand. Thus nature has done her share in providing the foundation for a glass and mirror industry, but it has not yet risen to any prominence. There are needed skilled labor, a good home market, and cheap fuel. Spain is rich in iron, copper, lead, zinc, antimony and silver, yet she exports all except the last two in the form of ore, to be smelted and manufactured elsewhere. In true coal Spain is not well supplied, but she has an abundance of peat and lignite, and means have now been dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

covered of producing excellent charcoal from these substances. Until within recent years mining was discouraged by taxes which were designed to promote the exploitation of colonial mines, from the product of which the Crown was able to claim a liberal share. At present the mining industry is abundantly fostered and protected by law, but it is chiefly carried on by French and English capital. Mineral waters of every sort abound in Spain. The baths were noted in Roman and Moorish days, but even the chief of these have failed to bid vigorously for foreign patronage, and they present evidences of neglect. The foreigner is everywhere an object of childish suspicion, and facilities have not been provided for his entertainment. All this is in marked contrast to the spirit which prevails in Austria and Bohemia. In those countries resources in the way of baths and mineral waters, which might be called scant in comparison with those of Spain, have been industriously utilized. The chief centers of the iron and steel trade are along the Bay of Biscay and in Galicia. The state cannon factory is at Trubia, near Oviedo. The ancient city of Toledo was once famous for the art and industry of the Moors in the manufacture of sword blades. The cutlery trade has since been carried to Albacete, in the mountains of North Murcia, where it is fortified by the large local demand for the daggers and long knives carried by the inhabitants to adjust their social difficulties.

Apart from the industrial region of which Barcelona is the trade capital, and the centers which have been mentioned, there may be found here and there the survivals of ancient industries kept alive by local skill or ancient reputation. Thus Seville manufactures some porcelain and Cordova a little leather. In the southern part of the central plateau the little town of Almagro continues a lace industry, founded generations ago, while Reyna, to the west of Toledo, manufactures silk.

In its commercial life Spain is not highly developed. The coast has a light trade with foreign countries, but the center of the peninsula is, industrially, an indigestible core. A glance at a Spanish railroad map shows that a chief care of the state has been to strengthen the power of the capital by making it a railroad center. The streams of commerce do not correspond with the river systems, and the latter could not be used for communication, if they did. From the map one would judge Spain to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well provided with rivers. As a matter of fact, the total length of all navigable rivers and canals is 430 miles. The meaning of this may be seen by contrasting it with France, which has 7,700 miles of inland navigable waters. Whether it is because of the absence of a competitive means of transportation or not, railroad rates are exorbitantly high. The wheat and cattle of the north must penetrate a wall of mountains to reach the port of Santander. The mules, wool, and cork of Estremadura are gathered at Badajoz. Esparto grass is shipped from Cartagena. The chief imports of Spain are cotton, drugs, coal, wood, machines and wagons. The leading exports are wine, iron ore, animal products, lead, fruit, copper and esparto grass. The countries with which Spain does the most of her business are England, France, United States, Germany and Portugal. From Spain the United States has received almonds, cork, iron ore, licorice, mineral waters, skins, tartar, and sherry, besides the fresh and preserved fruits which are fast being driven off our markets by the products of Florida and California. To Spain our chief exports have been cotton, petroleum, tobacco, machinery, and staves used for wine casks.

A map of the density of population in Spain shows that the regions of greatest density are along the coast. The peninsula shows a fringe of fertile and prosperous country. The nation camps upon its borders, and presents to the outside world hardly more than a shell, having its political head and directing center suspended within it in a capital which is nowhere in close connection with the living tissue of the race and nation. Of the rule of the central region Mr. Webster has said: "It is one of the misfortunes of Spain that from the advantage of their elevated, central physical position, the Castilians, as warriors and statesmen, at all times among the least civilized of her peoples, have been able to rule and control the more civilized and more advanced communities of the seaboard. It is a want of discernment of this fact which makes so many of the picturesque histories of Spain utterly fail in explaining the origin and the progressive causes of her present condition." The maritime populations were held together to expel the Moors. But when not under intense pressure, they have easily perceived that their interests differ widely from those of the central region. Thus the rule of Castile has been looked upon in many districts as foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and hostile. The political history has been marked by civil dissensions. Barcelona has been federalistic and revolutionary, and has played the same *rôle* that Marseilles has taken in France. The Atlantic coast has been Girondist, as in France, while the center has been the stronghold of conservatism and royalism. This lukewarm patriotism, springing from a lack of proper economic and social bonds to knit the nation into a whole, explains the political corruption that has long been rife and the hesitancy and inefficiency of the central government. The political life of Madrid is, in a way, analogous to its economic life. The city is in a region that can do little towards its support. It stands on sandy hills in the midst of a treeless, infertile plain. Vegetables and fruits for the population must be brought from distant Valencia. Wheat comes from across the Guadarrama mountains, while manufactured goods are brought from Catalonia or are imported from abroad. The local industries are chiefly for the purpose of providing articles of luxury demanded by the royal household and a large official and military class. The economic life of the city is artificial; it is not rooted into the soil on which it stands.

Spain needs schools and progressive agricultural and commercial newspapers. She needs to look at home to the condition of her fields and roads and canals, rather than to waste herself in foreign dominion. She needs to learn that a new order of knighthood has arisen depending upon industry and honesty, and that this has supplanted the stilted parade of ancient lineages and the touchy pomposity of petty office.

EDWARD D. JONES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES SENATE: ITS ORIGIN, PERSONNEL AND ORGANIZATION.

BY THE HON. W. A. PEFFER, LATE U. S. SENATOR FOR KANSAS.

BEING Englishmen, the founders of the colonies from which grew the United States knew little of any form of government other than that of Great Britain, so their descendants, when they came to form a government of their own and to organize its powers, were naturally inclined to adopt the English system in so far at least as it would not interfere with the free exercise of popular rights; accordingly, the builders of the Constitution, when they had agreed that the legislative department of the proposed government should consist of a Senate and House of Representatives, and when their discussions turned upon the materials of which the Senate should be composed, frequently alluded to the House of Lords and the character and qualifications of its members as models fit to be studied.

Mr. Dickinson, of Delaware, said he "wished that the Senate might consist of the most distinguished characters—distinguished for their rank in life and their weight of property."

Colonel Mason, of Virginia, favored a property qualification for members of the upper house, and a "long tenure of office."

Much time was spent in the convention considering the best methods to secure a high order of men for Senators. Mr. Hamilton, of New York, thought that they ought to be chosen by electors selected by the people in election districts. Mr. Randolph said the lower house was the proper body to select the membership of the upper house.

While there was diversity of opinion among the delegates concerning the number of Senators, the manner of choosing them, their duties, etc., there was a general agreement that it would be well to provide for one legislative body whose members would probably be selected with more care than would likely be exercised

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the people at large in popular elections, and who, therefore, would presumably be less susceptible to influences of sudden movements among the voters. Mr. Madison said: "The use of the Senate is to consist in its proceeding with more coolness, with more system and with more wisdom than the popular branch."

Three of the four drafts of a constitution submitted to the convention provided for a lower and an upper house of the national legislature.

The then existing government of the United States was administered by the Continental Congress, a body composed of able, patriotic, brave men, but they had not authority to levy taxes or collect revenues or coin money. They were not empowered to regulate commerce, either domestic or foreign. In the Articles of Confederation each State retained its "sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right," which was not by the Confederation "expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled." It was conceded on all hands that a stronger government was necessary for the safety of the Republic—a government with full powers for national purposes, having original and exclusive jurisdiction over all matters appertaining to the people of the United States as a nation, and the convention called for May 14, 1787, at Philadelphia, was held for the purpose of preparing a form for such a government. The defects of the existing arrangement were set out in the objects sought to be accomplished by the Constitution as they are expressed in the preamble: "To form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The first section of the first article of the Constitution provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

In enumerating the powers deemed necessary for the successful operation of the new government machinery, the several States were required to surrender some important prerogatives of sovereignty, and in order to make sure that they would not be overreached by the Federal power and that the small States would not be crowded to the wall by the larger ones, it was provided that not only should there be two Houses of Congress, but that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"no State without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." And to make it reasonably certain that every State would always be represented in the Senate, it was further provided that each State should have two Senators, one in each of two of the three classes into which the Senate was to be divided, and that each Senator should have one vote.

The Senators first chosen answered well to the ideals outlined by delegates in the convention which created the office of Senator. One-half of them had been members of the convention that framed the Constitution, and seventeen of the twenty-two had taken part in the work of the Continental Congress. Eleven of them were lawyers, and among the other half the record shows one merchant, one man of business, one physician and one farmer.

It is provided in the Constitution that the Senators, "immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of their first election, shall be divided as equally as may be in three classes. The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year." In pursuance of this provision the members of the Senate, at its first session, divided themselves by lot into three classes, according to the following order:

"Ordered, That the Secretary put into the ballot box three papers of equal size, one of which shall be numbered 1, one of which shall be numbered 2, and one of which shall be numbered 3. The Senator from each of said States whose name comes first in alphabetical order shall thereupon, in the presence of the Senate, draw one of said papers from the box in behalf of his State. The Senators from the States drawing the paper numbered 1 shall thereupon first be assigned to their respective classes. The Senators from the States drawing paper number 2 shall next be assigned to their respective classes. The Senators from the States drawing paper number 3 shall next be assigned to their respective classes."

That classification has been strictly followed from that time to the present. Every Senator chosen since from any of the States then and there represented has gone into the class of his first predecessor in line, and when a new State has been admitted its first Senators were assigned to their classes by lot, just as was done in the first instance, and their successors have followed in the same classes. This classification of its members makes the Senate a permanent and continuing body. Two-thirds of its members

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are always in office. There is never less than a quorum of its members ready for duty. The House of Representatives is chosen anew every two years. No member of that body ever holds over. When the House adjourns *sine die* at 12 M., March 4, of the odd numbered years, the term of that House is ended and until the new Congress meets there is no House of Representatives. When the members chosen at the last election meet in special or regular session, they must organize by choosing a speaker, clerk and sergeant-at-arms before they can do any business, even to the extent of receiving a message from the President. It must adopt new rules or re-adopt old ones. In law and in fact it is wholly a new body fresh from the people, though some of its members may have been there before.

Not so with the Senate. Its officers hold continuously until they are relieved by the choice of others. The Senate is always organized. The rules of the body never change or they go out of force only in accord with methods provided in the rules themselves. On the incoming of a new administration, March 4, at 12 o'clock M., the Senate is then regularly in session, for that is the closing hour of a term of Congress—two years. The new Vice-President appears at the side of his retiring predecessor and receives the oath of office from him. This done, the old Vice-President formally declares the Senate adjourned *sine die* and hands the gavel over to his successor, who says, "The Senate will be in order," and at once proceeds to business, without the least confusion or interruption. He enters immediately upon the discharge of his duties. The officers of the Senate are present in their places, the reporters at their tables, the sergeant-at-arms and his corps of assistants—all on duty, and the standing and select committees of the body are ready to receive and consider any matter that may be referred to them. The Senate is already organized. In law and in fact it is now the same body that counted its first quorum on the 6th of April, 1789.

The effect of this continuity of the Senate has been to give character and weight to its proceedings, to inspire confidence at home and insure respect abroad. Such a body, clothed as this is with the power of ratifying treaties, renders complications with foreign governments less probable and our obligations more likely to be observed.

One-third the Senators being chosen every second year, they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are inducted into office at the first session of the Senate after their election, but that in no way affects the organization or the business of the body. The Senate could proceed without them.

The installation of the new Senators is a very simple proceeding. As their names are called in alphabetical order by the Secretary of the Senate they go forward to the Vice-President's desk, escorted usually by their State colleagues, and they take the oath of office in the following form:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

This form of oath was prescribed by statute July 11, 1868. The old form provided June 1, 1789, was short:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States."

If, for any reason, the Vice-President-elect should not appear at the beginning of the session, the duties of his office are performed by the President *pro tempore;* and in case of the latter's absence another Senator previously agreed upon would take the oath and discharge the duties of the chair until the Vice-President appear or the Senate determine otherwise.

If a vacancy happen in a Senator's term by death, resignation or otherwise, during a recess of the legislature of his State, the Executive thereof may make a temporary appointment to hold until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancy. The person so appointed or elected does not hold beyond the end of that senatorial term. In case the legislature fail to choose a Senator at the proper time the Governor is not authorized to appoint. The vacancy continues until the next meeting of the legislature. The word "meeting" in this case is construed to include the whole session.

"No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen." No Senator shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the United States which shall have been created, or of which the emoluments shall have been increased, during such term. No person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of the Senate during his continuance in such office. No person shall be a Senator who having as a Federal or State officer, taken an oath

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to support the Constitution, afterwards engaged in rebellion against the United States, unless Congress remove such disability.

Usually men beyond middle age are selected for Senators. In 1893 the average age in the Senate was 58 years. The oldest member was 83, the youngest 39. The oldest member of the body at any time is now (May, 1898) in office—Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, who was born April 14, 1810, and is therefore in his eighty-ninth year. He has been longer in the Senate, too, than any other man, having entered on the fourth day of March, 1867, and he has been returned regularly ever since. His present term expires March 4, 1903. Henry Clay entered the Senate at an earlier age than any other. He was appointed November 19, 1806, to fill a vacancy. Mr. Clay was born April 12, 1777.

Nine hundred and seven different men have been members of the Senate. Among the curious facts connected with the personal history of some of them may be mentioned these: General James Shields represented three different States in the Senate, Illinois from March 4, 1849, till March 3, 1855; Minnesota from May 12, 1858, till March 3, 1859; Missouri from January 24, 1879, till March 3, 1879. Three men of the same family—James A. Bayard, his son of the same name, and his grandson, Thomas F. Bayard, represented Delaware—the first from January, 1805, till March, 1813; the second from April, 1867, till March, 1869, and the third from March, 1869, till March, 1885. Three other men of the same family name also represented Delaware in the Senate—Joshua Clayton from January 19, 1798, till his death the following July; Thomas Clayton from January 8, 1824, till March 3, 1827, and again from January 9, 1837, till March 3, 1847; John M. Clayton from March 4, 1845, till February 23, 1849, and again from March 4, 1853, till his death, November 9, 1856. Three men named Bell—two of them brothers, the third a son of one of them, represented New Hampshire in the Senate—Samuel Bell from March 4, 1823, till March 4, 1835, his son, James Bell, from July 30, 1855, till May 26, 1859, and Charles Henry Bell from March 13, 1879 till June 17, 1879. Nineteen of the Senators' names begin with "Mc," twelve of them were named Smith, and Johnsons and Browns were represented by eight each. At one time during the Cleveland administration both of the Senators from each of three different States resided in the same city, and three Senators occupying adjoining seats and represent-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing two States, were born in adjoining counties in one State. In 1892 two Senators, representing one State, had been private soldiers in one and the same volunteer regiment of the Union Army.

Of the 907 Senators, seventeen afterward became Presidents of the United States—Monroe, Adams (J. Q.), Jackson, Van Buren, Harrison (Wm. H.), Tyler, Pierce, Buchanan, Johnson, Garfield and Harrison (Benjamin).

Two hundred and twenty-eight of them resigned and one hundred and ten died while in office.

The first Senator that died during his term was Wm. Grayson, of Virginia, whose death occurred March 1, 1790. The custom of taking public and official action on the decease of a Senator and of incurring expense on account thereof, was of slow growth. During the first thirty-seven years of the Senate's history twenty-two of its members died and no expense was incurred by Congress in that behalf. The first record of the Senate's official action of any character in such cases appears in the *Journal* of January 24, 1799, as follows: "Resolved, That a committee be appointed to take order for superintending the funeral of the said Henry Tazewell, Esq., and that the Senate will attend the same, and that notice of the event be given to the House of Representatives, and that this committee consist of Messrs. Mason, Brown and Marshall."

The first time any part of a deceased Senator's funeral expenses was paid out of public funds was on the occasion of the death of John Gaillard, of South Carolina, who died February 26, 1826. Two other Senators died that year—Nicholas Van Dyke, of Delaware, May 19, and Joseph McIlvaine, of New Jersey, August 19. The average public expense incurred on account of these three deaths was $292.47. Within the next twenty-two years—from 1826 to 1847 inclusive, twenty-seven Senators died, and the remains of eleven of them were interred at the government's expense. The average expenditure in those cases was $618.80. From 1848 to 1867, inclusive, twenty-eight Senators died, and eighteen of them were buried by the Senate at an average expenditure of $1,365.13. The record from 1869 to 1894* shows thirty deaths in the Senate, and all but five of

* There have been three deaths in the Senate since 1894, but this writer has not inquired about the details of their obsequies. Presumably the precedents were followed in each case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these were the occasion of more or less outlay of public money, the aggregate amounting to $68,849.96, an average of $2,754. In all, up to 1894, there were fifty-four interments from and by the Senate, and the last thirteen cost more, by $4,139.82, than all of the other forty-one. The total amount of public moneys expended on account of Senatorial funerals, up to 1894, is $100,234.18, ranging from $4.50 in one case to $21,322.55 in another. The average is $1,856.37.

These funeral occasions are now accompanied by a great deal of ceremonial display. The casket is placed in the open space in front of the reporters' tables, and the services are attended by the President and Cabinet, the House of Representatives, the Justices of the Supreme Court in their black robes, and, in full court dress, the resident ambassadors and ministers of foreign countries. Each of these bodies, as they approach the outer door of the chamber, is announced by the doorkeeper, and the Senators rise to receive them. When the services are concluded a committee previously appointed, usually consisting of five Senators and an equal number of members of the House, accompany the remains of the deceased to his home and witness the interment there.

At first it was only in cases of death at the Capitol during a session of Congress that the Senate felt called upon to make a national matter of the funeral and draw on the contingent fund to defray the expenses. Latterly a custom has grown to send a committee to attend the ceremonies of interment when a Senator dies at home while Congress is in session. The last instance of this proceeding occurred in 1894, at a cost to the government of $1,171.92.

In connection with the decease of Senators a memorial service is held in the Senate chamber a month or so after the time of the death, when addresses are delivered in memory of the dead Senator. These addresses are usually very carefully prepared. They are printed in the Congressional Record, the same as remarks submitted in the same place on other subjects, and they are also printed in book form, eight thousand copies in each case (under existing law), two thousand for the use of the Senate, four thousand for the use of the House of Representatives, one thousand nine hundred and fifty for the use of Senators and Congressmen from the State of the deceased and fifty copies in extra binding for the use

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his family. The printing and binding of these memorial addresses cost about $3,000. The exact figures as given in the report of the public printer for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, are $9,195.88 for the materials and work done in printing and binding eight thousand copies of the memorial addresses in each case of the deaths of three Senators. The average is $3,065.29.

A similar custom prevails in the House of Representatives. The expense for printing and binding memorial addresses in memory of fifty-four deceased Senators and Congressmen from 1885 to 1895, both inclusive, was $233,520.44.

A bill was introduced in the Senate December 3, 1895, "to provide for proper disposition of the remains of deceased members of the Senate and House of Representatives who die at the Capitol during sessions of Congress." After discussion it was referred to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report a rule on the subject matter of the bill. No report was made.

As to compensation of Senators and Representatives, it is to be "ascertained by law." That is the language of the Constitution, and it means that Congress shall fix its own compensation.

No distinction has ever been made between members of the two Houses in respect to the amount of their pay. Their compensation has always been equal. By the act of September 22, 1789, it was fixed at six dollars for every day's attendance, and an equal sum for every twenty miles' travel going to and returning from the "seat of Congress." This rule was to remain in force until March 4, 1795, when it was to be changed to seven dollars per day and mileage to correspond. March 10, 1796, the law of 1789 was re-enacted and it remained in force until the act of March 19, 1816, increased the pay to $1,500 a year, subject to deduction for absence not occasioned by sickness or other unavoidable reason.

This act was repealed the 6th day of the following February (1817), and on January 22, 1818, the compensation of each Senator and Representative was fixed at eight dollars for every day's attendance and eight dollars "for every twenty miles of estimated distance, by the most usual road from his place of residence to the seat of Congress, at the commencement and end of every such session and meeting." This act was to cover the time from March 3, 1817, and it remained in force until August

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

16, 1856, when the rate of compensation was changed from eight dollars a day to $6,000 for each Congress (two years), mileage remaining the same as before, for but only one session each year.

By act of July 28, 1866, a yearly salary of $5,000 was allowed with mileage at the rate of twenty cents per mile to and from each regular session, "estimated by the nearest route usually travelled."

The act of March 3, 1873, fixed the salary at $7,500 a year and actual individual travelling expenses to and from each session "by the most direct route of usual travel." This act applied to the Congress that passed it, covering two years, and from that fact became known as the "salary grab" law. It was repealed at the next session, January 20, 1874, in so far as it applied to members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and their compensation was put at $5,000 a year with mileage at the rate of twenty cents per mile to and from each regular session.

Most of these acts were retro-active in their operation, that of September 22, 1789, covering the time from the beginning of that Congress. The act of March 10, 1796, extended back six days. The act of March 19, 1816, covered the time from March 4, 1815. The act of January 2, 1818, applied to fifty-three days of past time. The act of August 16, 1856, applied to all the time from March 4, 1855. The act of July 28, 1866, reached back to March 4, 1865. The act of March 3, 1873, covered the whole term of that Congress, beginning March 4, 1871—two years.

There has not been any general law allowing mileage for attendance upon special or extraordinary sessions. Where it has been authorized it was by special act applicable to the particular session.

There have been two rules regulating the compensation of Senators and Representatives, one before the war of the Rebellion, the other since. The earlier acts were all drawn on lines of actual service—so much a day for each day of attendance upon the sessions, excepting days of sickness or unavoidable absence. The act of 1856, in section four, provided:

"That in the event of the death of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate prior to the commencement of the first session of the Congress, he shall be entitled neither to mileage nor compensation; and in the event of death after the commencement of any session his representatives shall be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entitled to receive so much of his compensation, computed at the rate of three thousand dollars per annum, as he may not have received, and any mileage that may have actually accrued and be due and unpaid."

Section six of the same act provided:

"That it shall be the duty of the sergeant-at-arms of the House and secretary of the Senate, respectively, to deduct from the monthly payments to members, as herein provided for, the amount of his compensation for each day that such member shall be absent from the House or Senate respectively, unless such Representative, Senator or Delegate shall assign as the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or some member of his family."

The Vice-President, being in doubt when the compensation of Senators that had been chosen since the session commenced should begin, submitted the question to the Senate and it was referred to the Judiciary Committee, who, through Mr. Toombs, March 2, 1857, submitted a report, from which the following extracts are taken:

"Though the mode of payment is by annual salary, the consideration therefor, in the contemplation of the act (of 1856) was performance of the duties of a member of Congress when in actual session, and the times of payment seem to have been fixed during or at the end of each session, with special reference to securing this consideration. . . . Testing the cases submitted to us by those principles, we find the rule of compensation in all cases of election after the first day of the first regular session to be that the compensation does not commence until after election, and from thence to the end of the term, at the rate of $3,000 per annum."

Minnesota was admitted as a State May 11, 1858, and her Senators, who had been elected December 19, 1857, appeared and took their seats May 12, 1858. The question when their compensation should commence arose, and the Judiciary Committee reported that they should be paid from the date of the State's admission.

They were paid from the beginning of the session at which the State was admitted. But the question was not settled. Oregon was admitted February 14, 1859, Kansas, January 29, 1861, West Virginia, December 31, 1862, Nevada, October 31, 1864. During all this time the act of 1856 was in force. Then came the act of July 11, 1866, and Nebraska was admitted March 1, 1867. The reorganization of the reconstructed States and the admission of their Senators, kept the matter alive until the new northwestern States came in. The Senators from Tennessee were seated July 27, 1866, and paid from March 4, 1865, the beginning of the Congress then in being (the thirty-fifth). A Senator from Maryland was elected for the term beginning March 4, 1867, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was not admitted and received no compensation. March 7, 1868, another person was elected to fill the vacancy and his salary was paid to him from March 4, 1867, the beginning of the term. Senators from Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina and other Southern States, claimed and finally secured payment of salaries from the beginning of the terms for which they were elected without reference to the time of their election.

By a proviso in the legislative appropriation bill of July 31, 1894, it was enacted that in cases of the election or appointment of Senators after the beginning of a term, their compensation should begin the day of their election or appointment. The legislatures of Montana and Wyoming failed to choose Senators at their sessions in 1893 for the terms beginning March 4 of that year, but did elect Senators for that term at their sessions in January, 1895. The credentials of these Senators were filed in the Senate—one of them January 29, 1895, the other February 2d following. They appeared and took the oath of office, one on the second of February, the other on the sixth of the same month. By a resolution of the Senate April 24, 1896, the Secretary of the Senate was directed to pay them from March 4, 1893, the beginning of the term, until July 31, 1894, the date of the proviso in the appropriation bill above mentioned, which had taken effect nearly six months before the Senators were elected.

Section six of the act of August 16, 1856, requiring deductions of pay for absence of Senators and Representatives is preserved in the Revised Statutes, Section forty, and is now the law.

Joint Resolution No. 68, approved July, 1862, provides:

"When any member or delegate withdraws from his seat and does not return before the adjournment of Congress he shall, in addition to the sum deducted for each day, forfeit a sum equal to the amount which would have been allowed by law for his travelling expenses in returning home; and such sum shall be deducted from his compensation, unless the withdrawal is with the leave of the Senate or House of Representatives respectively."

This provision, also, is preserved in the Revised Statutes as Section forty-one.

A statement of the amount of money deducted from the wages of Senators in pursuance of the provisions of these two sections of the law would add greatly to the interest and value of this paper, but the writer has not been able to find accounts of that character in any of the late reports of the disbursing officer of the Senate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Constitution provides that:

"The Vice-President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless they be equally divided. The Senate shall choose their other officers and also a President *pro tempore* in the absence of the Vice-President or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States."

The first duty of the Senate, on its organization, April 6, 1789, was the choosing of a President *pro tempore* for the sole purpose of opening and counting the (electoral) votes for President of the United States.*

John Langdon of New Hampshire, was chosen by ballot. After the votes had been counted and the members of the House of Representatives had retired, the Senate proceeded by ballot to the choice of President *pro tempore* and John Langdon was duly elected. He held his office only until the Vice-President appeared. In the beginning and until recently a President *pro tempore* was chosen every time the Vice-President was absent. It is now the rule that the office is held at the pleasure of the Senate; until the Vice-President resumes the chair or his term as a Senator expires, the President *pro tempore* continues in office unless the Senate otherwise determine.

During a vacancy in the office of Vice-President, and while the Vice-President exercises the office of President of the United States,† the President *pro tempore* of the Senate receives the salary of a Vice-President, but he has no vote other than that of a Senator.

Of the twenty-four Vice-Presidents, one (Calhoun) resigned; four (Gerry, King, Wilson and Hendricks) died in office; and four (Tyler, Fillmore, Johnson and Arthur) exercised the office of President of the United States during vacancies in that office occasioned by death.

All of the twenty-three Vice-Presidents preceding the present incumbent, except two (Morton and Stevenson), are dead. Their average age was seventy years.

Sixty-three Senators have served as Presidents *pro tempore*,

*Until the provisions for selecting a Vice-President were changed in 1804, that officer was not voted for at all by the Presidential Electors. They voted for "two persons" only, and when the votes were counted the person having received the highest number, if that was a majority of the whole number of electors, was declared to be President; and the person receiving the next highest number of votes was declared to be Vice-President.

† Whether a vacancy in the office of Vice-President is occasioned by that officer's exercising the office of President of the United States has not been determined.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and all but five of them, excluding the Senator (Frye) now holding that office, are dead. They belonged to twenty-two different States, Virginia leading with six; Connecticut, Georgia, North Carolina, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Vermont each had three; Alabama, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts and Rhode Island each had two; Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey and New York each had one. The present incumbent (Mr. Frye) is from Maine.

The other important officers of the Senate are the Secretary and Sergeant-at-arms. The Secretary, in addition to his responsibility for the official conduct of a large number of clerks, readers, reporters, copyists, and other subordinates about his office, has charge of everything connected with the records, journals, reports, bills and other documents, papers and proceedings of the Senate, legislative and executive. The Secretary is also a disbursing officer and gives bond for a proper discharge of his duties as such. He receives and pays out more than a million dollars annually. This includes salaries and mileage of Senators, of officers, clerks, and other employees about the Senate. Here are the items summarized in that officer's report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896.

Amounts expended:

Salaries and mileage (of Senators)	$467,175.22
Salary of Vice-President	6,000.00
Salaries of officers, clerks, etc	422,852.42
One month's extra pay to officers and employees	40,035.61
Salaries Capitol Police	19,392.53
Contingent expenses	165,920.55
Total	$1,121,376.33

The Sergeant-at-Arms, with his corps of assistants, has charge of the Senate wing of the Capitol building. He takes care of the Senate chamber and all the property in it, and of the various rooms, halls and other apartments and annexes. He purchases all their furniture and other equipments. He attends to all the details of great occasions in and about the hall of the Senate—inaugurations and the like, and he or one of his assistants accompanies every Senate committee that travels by order of the Senate. He arranges for their transportation and entertainment, and pays all the bills. He executes all orders of the Senate relating to any matter of an executive character. He is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the Senate what a marshal or a sheriff is to a court. He is the Senate's executive officer.

The principal offices of the Senate are honorable as well as responsible. They require a high order of talent combined with good executive ability. Two members of the Senate each afterwards became its Secretary. In several instances men who had been members of the House of Representatives have been elected to offices in the Senate.

The number of persons employed in one capacity or another in and about the Senate is over three hundred. An investigation recently discovered 353, among whom were 121 clerks, 57 messengers, 52 skilled laborers, 23 pages and 18 folders.

Salaries of Senate officers and employees range as follows: Laborers and pages, $720 to $1,000 a year; messengers and clerks to Senators, $1,440; clerks to committees, $1,800 to $3,000; Secretary's chief clerk and the financial clerk, each $3,000; Secretary of the Senate, $5,000; Sergeant-at-Arms, $4,500. The official reporting of the proceedings and debates is done by contract at $25,000 a year.

At the beginning committees of the Senate were appointed only for special duties—as to wait upon the President, to prepare a rule for a particular proceeding, to consider a certain matter and report a bill, etc. The committee first appointed by the Senate consisted of five members to confer with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives and report rules to govern in cases of conference between the two houses. They were also to "take under consideration the manner of electing chaplains." There was some feeling on the chaplaincy question, but the choice of men of different religious denominations—one for the House, the other for the Senate—disposed of the matter satisfactorily.

Gradually, as the lines of legislative procedure became marked, and as the business of Congress grew in magnitude and variety, it was found necessary as well as convenient to appoint standing committees to hold during the pleasure of the Senate for the consideration of classified subjects. There are now forty-nine standing committees of the Senate, of which one has fifteen members; six consist of thirteen members each; twelve have each eleven members; eleven have nine members; four have seven; four have five; and five have three. The others have even num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers and are subject to changes. There are also ten select committees.

The largest committees are those on Appropriations, Commerce, Judiciary, Pensions, Claims, Coast Defenses, District of Columbia, Finance, Foreign Relations, Immigration, Indian Affairs, Inter-state Commerce, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post Offices and Post Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Railroads and Territories.*

W. A. PEFFER.

*NOTE.—In another and concluding article the privileges, powers and functions of the Senate, and its rules and methods of transacting business will be presented.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENGLISH PRISON SYSTEM.

BY MAJOR ARTHUR GRIFFITHS, HER MAJESTY'S INSPECTOR OF PRISONS.

"To give a dog a bad name and hang him," is the short shrift which some critics and malcontents would apply to the English prison system. Fault-finding has gone great lengths; the language used has not been quite parliamentary. Our prisons have been called "living hells," our system the "most brutal in Europe." Such exaggerated invective confutes itself, and carries no weight with educated and impartial public opinion. Much of it proceeds from sources that may be fairly stigmatized as tainted; a few, no doubt, speaking out of their own experience, are honest enough; but their sense of proportion must have been distorted, their temper soured, their judgment deranged by a detention in durance vile which they believed to be unjustifiable. One of the fiercest complainants has been a notorious felon whose very name is unsavory and unmentionable, but who has repaid extreme consideration by libelling the treatment that gave him a new lease of life and strength. Of course, the well-meaning philanthropist and humanitarian who has raised his protests with no uncertain sound is not to be classed with these; even if he has proceeded on imperfect information, his motives are generally excellent and he is entitled to every respect. He is entitled, too, to an answer to some rebutting statements, to a candid exposure of facts as they appear to the other side, supported by such evidence as is forthcoming. *Qui s'excuse s'accuse;* yet silence might be interpreted as assent, and when no appearance is put in, judgment might go by default.

It may be premised that the system now in force is no new thing; it is no recent invention, but the growth of years, of generations, the outcome of slow, cautious experiment. One of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the features now most strenuously denounced, separate confinement, is older than the century. John Howard found cellular accommodation in the *Maison de Force* of Ghent in 1775, and he hailed it with enthusiasm as an ideal prison. In 1786 the Quakers of Pennsylvania had established the same system in the Walnut Street Prison in Philadelphia. It was copied at Sing Sing when old Elam Lynds made his prisoners build their own lodgings, cell by cell. It was the main idea of the Great Millbank Penitentiary constructed on the banks of the Thames in 1816, at the cost of half a million sterling, to carry out the views of John Howard and Jeremy Bentham, and in which "separation," "solitude," were carried to their furthest limits. The Eastern Penitentiary of Philadelphia pursued the same course to receive the same strictures, for the excessive application of the system found many opponents. Yet the Millbank Committee, when compelled in 1840 to relax it in the face of distressing consequences, did so reluctantly, believing that "no scheme of discipline in which intercourse between prisoners, however modified, is permitted, is likely to be made instrumental either in the prevention of crime or to the personal reformation of convicts, to the same degree as a system of separation." They could not decide whether such a system could be made "compatible with the maintenance of mental sanity," and they advocated its trial under proper safeguards in some model prison. This was the origin of Pentonville, truly the "model," for it has been accepted as the true type and imitated all the world over. Here the experiment is not deemed satisfactory, and the period of separation was successively reduced, from two years to eighteen months, then to twelve months, and finally to nine months, the present maximum for penal servitude, although in ordinary imprisonment it may be imposed for two years.

The plan of separation thus limited has been in force with us for upward of fifty years. It has not perhaps effected what was hoped from it, but certainly it has not produced the mischievous results now laid at its door. As regards mental deterioration, the figures are convincing and will be given later in connection with insanity in the whole of the prisons. Separation may not have acted as a powerful deterrent, yet experience shows that it is most obnoxious to the habitual criminal, while the neophytes and first offenders distinctly prefer it to association with others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That reformation is much aided by this period of penitential isolation may be doubted; it is an artificial state of existence, and the good intentions it may develop may not be very deep and abiding, but it has the prescription of long usage and, till lately, was very generally approved by public opinion. The trend of public sentiment is of late against it. The Home Secretary has now consented to reduce the nine months to six, and it may yet be surrendered altogether, except at night and during idle hours. To give up separation at such times would be retrograde and disastrous. It is hardly necessary to point out that the free intercourse of persons would promptly produce fatal results, mutual contamination and the rapid propagation of vice and crime. It is fitting to add here that other civilized nations adopt solitary confinement in its strictest sense and for very long terms. In Belgium separation, absolute and complete, is enforced for five, seven, and even ten years. France, although still wanting a sufficient number of cells, is prepared to do the same; so is Holland.

The guiding principle of all penal treatment was well defined by the Millbank Committee as quoted above. It was reiterated and amplified later by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn. He said:

"The purposes of punishment are twofold. The first is that of delivering others from crime; the second, the reformation of the criminal himself. The first is the primary and more important object; for, though society has, of course, a strong interest in the reformation of the criminal and his consequent indisposition to crime, yet the result is here confined to the individual offender, while the effect of punishment as deterring from crime extends not only to the party suffering the punishment, but to all who may be in the habit of committing crime or who may be tempted to fall into it; moreover, the reformation of the offender is in the highest degree speculative and uncertain, and its permanency, in the face of renewed temptation, exceedingly precarious. On the other hand, the impression produced by suffering inflicted as the punishment of crime, and the fear of its repetition, are far more likely to be lasting and much more likely to counteract the tendency to the renewal of criminal habits. It is on the assumption that punishment will have the effect of deterring from crime that its infliction can alone be justified; its proper and legitimate purposes being not to avenge crime, but to prevent it."

Lord Cockburn wrote thus in 1863, soon after the terrible outbreak of garrote robberies in London, which were largely attributed to the weakening of the reins of penal discipline, and the premature release of many criminals on too easily earned tickets of leave. General alarm prevailed; life and property were more seriously threatened than at any previous period, and Lord Cockburn fully indorsed the general opinion as to the causes that pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duced this effect. "It may well be doubted," he goes on to say, "whether in recent times the humane and praiseworthy desire to restore and reform the fallen criminal may not have produced too great a tendency to forget that the protection of society should be the first consideration of the law-giver." We may see clearly enough that now the swing of the pendulum is once again towards sacrificing the interest of society to a misplaced tenderness for those who offend against its laws. How far are we nowadays disposed to observe the axiom enunciated by Lord Cockburn; to keep the subsidiary purpose of penal discipline—reformation—in due subordination to its primary and principal aim—deterrence? The burthen of the present cry for prison reform is that the existing system neglects the one and carries the other too far. To arrive at a just conclusion let us examine the processes in force, their sufficiency or otherwise to compass the desired end in their relative proportion.

Let us take the principal point first, that of deterrence. It has been urged of late that the punishment inflicted is excessive, unequal in its incidence, careless, neglectful; productive, indeed, of much human suffering; that withal there is no real deterrence, for crime flourishes, and the only tangible effect of imprisonment is the manufacture of habitual criminals. This last assertion may be flatly contradicted at once. It is altogether disproved by the facts. The Committee presided over by Mr. Herbert Gladstone in 1894 presented some remarkable figures on this point. They reported that, with certain reserves due to the difficulty of detecting all first offenders, seventy per cent. of those committed to prison for the first time never return again; forty-eight per cent of the remainder are cured after a second imprisonment; or eighty-five per cent., in all, are deterred from crime after a first and second experience of gaol treatment. It is the small residue, no more than fifteen per cent., which constitute the class of recidivists, and among them, no doubt, reconvictions are terribly numerous. Of those three times convicted only thirty-six per cent. are cured, of those four times twenty-nine per cent., of those five times twenty-one per cent., and the descending scale of recovery shows how ingrained the habit of crime becomes with repetition. It is surely obvious that this irreconcilable residuum practically resists all treatment; their cases are chronic; radical cure is out of the question. We are thus brought logically to the conclusion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that where all medicines fail one course alone remains, that of indefinite detention. This is, in plain English, the "indeterminate sentence" already tried elsewhere, but which still finds little favor in this country. It is said that, even if the law permitted, judges would refuse to pass indeterminate sentences and the public would never tolerate them. Such arguments are unanswerable, excepting by actual experiment, and for that we are evidently unprepared. There are other than sentimental difficulties, no doubt; and chief among them would be that of deciding exactly when the habitual offender had worked out his redemption; to whom and how should he give reasonable assurance of his recovery from the bias to crime? This again could be settled only by practical test. But it is idle to discuss an idea that is resisted almost *ab initio* in spite of the many advantages claimed for it. The police, for instance, declare that if the obstinately determined habitual criminal, proved to be such, after, say, four or five convictions, were shut up *sine die*, there would be an end of serious crime. They say with reason that it is useless to catch criminals time after time, if they are to be let out to prey again upon the public after a more or less brief experience of penal restraint.

Another set of figures are at hand bearing upon this question of deterrence. The positive effect of prison treatment which may be fairly inferred from what has been said above, is corroborated by the steady diminution in the numbers who come under it. England alone among the nations can point to prisons half empty or recently closed. Some critics would discount this by contending that the marked decrease in the length of sentences has naturally resulted in a decrease of prison population. No one can deny this. But it does not explain how the daily average of convict inmates has fallen from 20,361 in 1876-7, to 14,966 in 1886-7, and to 13,987 in 1896-7, the last year for which we have figures. It must be borne in mind, moreover, that in the twenty years between 1876 and 1896 the general population has increased from twenty-four to thirty millions, which if crime had corresponded would have raised the total to 25,000. A still more marked diminution appears in the daily average of convicts in custody, which in 1896-7 was no more than 3,089, whereas in 1892-3 it was 3,832; and, tracing back these figures further, we see how extraordinarily great the decrease has been in modern times. In 1880 the daily average was as high as 10,299, and although the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendency was steadily downward it was still 9,247 in 1885, 6,680 in 1888, and in 1890, 5,359. It would be wrong to credit this satisfactory result entirely to deterrence, for many other causes have acted appreciably in affecting crime in this country. Prevention is far better understood than in times past, and it works effectively in child rescue, and cutting off the stream at its source. These agencies, with the general movement towards the infliction of lighter sentences, have also greatly helped to empty prisons. But there has, nevertheless, been a remarkable decrease in crime.

With all due allowance for the contributory causes last mentioned, a large balance must remain in favor of the deterrent effect of prison treatment in reducing crime. This we should bear in mind when reviewing penal processes. An impression prevails in some quarters that they are too severe; that they are not ineffective we have just seen. Surely this must be justified before milder methods are adopted with results that may be foreseen? Wherein does our present system err? The old idea of punishment was "hard fare, hard work, hard bed." Does it go beyond that? If it amounts to that, is it too much? Let us take each item in turn.

Our prison dietaries have been much criticised of late, much blamed, indeed. In English prisons the scale of food is proportioned to the length of sentences; for short terms it is intentionally meagre, but there is a progressive increase the longer the individual depends on it. It is now urged that, while the fullest rations are not satisfying, the lowest are absolutely insufficient. Number One diet, as it is styled officially, means no more than bread, eight ounces, for breakfast and supper; for dinner a pint and a half of "stir-about," a porridge or pudding made of mixed oatmeal and Indian meal (maize); the drink, cold water. This is undoubtedly short commons, especially for men who work, and work the men must, or break the rules. To many it may appear starvation, and the Home Secretary, in deference to protests, has consented to consider the question of increase. It is defended, however, by those who devised it, and they were medical experts. They say it is sufficient, if only barely sufficient, to keep soul and body together for the few days it is imposed, seven days at the outside; that it compares favorably with the diets allotted to able bodied paupers and casuals in workhouses, who are also required to work, at breaking stones. The last is not an argument, per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps ; for we cannot defend the starving of prisoners by saying that paupers are also starved. Undoubtedly men lose weight on it, on an average about two or three pounds ; but many come into prison bloated with drink, and their later lighter condition may be the healthier, while it is always within the powers of the prison doctor to issue extra food. As we pass on from Number One to Number Two, that given after the first week in the case of all terms up to a month, there is an improvement ; hot gruel for breakfast and supper, half a pint of thick, strong soup for dinner, thrice weekly, suet pudding half a pound, twice, with two banyan days of bread and potatoes. Between one month and four months prisoners begin on this Number Two, and after a month of it pass to Number Three, a fuller diet very much the same as Number Two, but in larger rations ; potatoes every day and three ounces of cooked beef (generally Australian or tinned) twice weekly. This Number Three is the first dietary for all sentenced to more than four months, with Number Four after the first month, a still more liberal allowance of the same constituents, and this lasts for the remainder of the term. At the risk of being tedious it may be added that the same scales, but in lesser quantities, are accorded to men without hard labor, women and lads under sixteen. Unconvicted persons and debtors, where neither support themselves, are placed on a dietary akin to Number Three, but with tea morning and evening; and convicts who are never sentenced to less than three years come at once upon Number Four. When they are drafted to the public-works prisons, such as Dartmoor, Borstal and Portland, their rations are considerably increased. The penal servitude convicts receive in the week 168 ounces of bread; the daily dinner consists of a pint of shin-of-beef soup and a pound of potatoes, or five ounces of cooked meat, or suet pudding, twelve ounces, and on Sunday salt pork and pease pudding. Cocoa and porridge replace gruel, while in the convict prisons, as in the local, medical officers are empowered to issue extra food to all who seem to need it.

Much exception has been taken to those dietaries of late, mainly on account of their alleged insufficiency. I have said that the very lowest is open to this charge, although not lower than that of other guests in public establishments which are the refuge of the unfortunate who have yet committed no breach of the law. The rest are defensible on the grounds that a spare dietary has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always been considered part and parcel of a penal system. Only in America, I think, under most of the State laws may prisoners eat *ad libitum,* but in continental Europe, where weights and scales are not always scrupulously used, there is an institution, the canteen, at which prisoners may purchase extra and perhaps more attractive food with a portion of their prison earnings. This is no doubt a safety valve, as well as a direct incentive to sustained industry. If the plan were adopted in England no one but the incurably idle need ever be hungry. This would also dispose of the objections raised against the hard and fast mechanical apportionment of rations, giving precisely the same quantities to one and all without considering that some constitutions require more food; that some are satisfied with less. Such differences, no doubt, exist and are met in part by the plenary powers of the medical officer, who can according to his judgment increase the allowance of all who seem to need it.

I cannot admit that there is any starvation in gaols. It would be readily apparent in low physique, in a hollow-eyed, generally enfeebled and emaciated aspect, and I can honestly affirm that I have found nothing of the kind among the thousands and thousands of prison inmates whom it has been my business to see year in and year out these last twenty odd years, excepting sometimes with the very "short timers." Prisoners improve owing to their detention; the bulk of them go out stronger, better, heavier than when they came in. This is the more pronounced the longer the sentences. Convicts in penal servitude, those especially who labor constantly in the open air, are robust, muscular and generally in first-rate condition.

It may, however, be conceded that there are points in which this prison dietary might be improved. It is, perhaps, too monotonous. Although the formula provides substitutes, they may not go far enough and, in the absence of the canteen system, the prisoner has no chance of remedying this defect for himself. Again, although as regards nutritive value the diet answers strict test, although it contains a sufficiency of the nitrogeneous, health-sustaining elements, it may fall short in bulk, in filling, satisfying quantity and may leave a sense of emptiness after every meal. We have here no doubt an explanation of the complaint which has been heard that convicts have been hungry for ten and fifteen years. This is now being met by an increase in the daily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ration of bread. But no substantial fault can be found with the preparation of meals. The cooking is as a rule good, cleanly and careful, the articles of food are of sound, wholesome quality, the bread—a staple part of the rations—is of "whole meal," the variety most popular with Sir Henry Thompson and other dietetic authorities, and the charges levelled against it, as producing chronic diarrhœa, are best met by the formal and explicit denial that there is any such complaint epidemic in prisons.

People must lie on their beds as they make them, and the prison plank-bed is a case in point. It is an element in the scheme of deterrence and has long been placed among the paraphernalia that exist to make the prison an unpleasant resting place. The deprivation of a mattress is only temporary, and there is a fair supply of other bedding. Whether it contributes much to the general result may be doubted, but before condemning it as a "harsh, cruel contrivance with no other object than to promote suffering," it may be remembered that every British soldier sleeps on a plank bed every night he is on guard, and this with his clothes and accoutrements on and without blanket or rug.

The judicious employment of those whose labor is forfeited to the state has always been an intricate problem in prison administration. It bristles with difficulties not realized by the ordinary observer. But it is well known in the United States that private traders resent state competition with prison made goods, and thus greatly curtail prison industries. The same protests have much checked useful employments in English prisons, and had not the administration found an outlet in producing goods for other public departments prison labor would have been limited indeed. The manufacture of various articles, mail bags and so forth for the post office, of coal sacks, kit bags, and hammocks for the Royal Navy, blankets and bedding for the army, is now very generally adopted and with excellent results. This is a better outlet than such poor primitive work as oakum picking or the soulless, unproductive labor of "grinding air" with treadmill or crank. The first is only practiced *faute de mieux;* the latter is being gradually abolished. In no case now does the tread wheel accomplish nothing; it would probably be altogether abandoned but for the necessity of finding some other severe physical labor for the short-time prisoners. The penalty to labor, and labor hard, is a statutory obligation on almost all committed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

durance, and the prison authority must impose what work it can. Where the detention is long enough to allow of any trade instruction, prisoners are preferably employed in handicrafts, although no high standard of skill can well be gained within prison walls. The proper use of all tools needs a long apprenticeship at an age when fingers are supple and brains adaptive; yet the prison-taught shoemaker, tailor, smith, stone dresser or bricklayer often turns out respectable work, and where great numbers are congregated, prison labor has given substantial proof of its value. It has enriched the nation with many fine public works, dock yards, breakwaters, fortifications and acres of land redeemed from mere bog and sterile waste. Without laying undue stress upon this, the utilitarian view, practical people must concede some credit to a system which has achieved such notable results.

Having thus set forth the principal penal processes employed, let us consider next their effect upon those subjected to them. Many hard things have been said of the system in force. We have heard that all prisoners are ground down and constantly oppressed, bound by many vexatious rules that create prison offences and multiply harsh prison punishments; that no one raises a finger in their defence, that all classes of prison officials from the highest to the lowest are in league to impose a senseless and unnecessarily severe and ruthless discipline. It has been asserted that the inevitable consequence is a dumb despair that seldom finds voice, but which the earnest inquirer will see written in appalling characters upon the prison statistics in the plain evidence of broken health, a large mortality and innumerable mental failures. Can such things be? Is it the fact that human beings, albeit criminal offenders, are thus shamefully misused, that their daily treatment outrages common justice, that their constant surroundings tend to chronic disease, to insanity and death? The indictment is tremendously strong? What is the defence?

The well meaning champions of the distressed prisoner, pleading in a cause that does them infinite credit, may yet be accused of over-charging, over-coloring their case. The discipline that is enforced in English gaols and convict prisons is, and necessarily must be, strict, but it is not, I think, unduly harsh. With the stamp of people incarcerated, stringent rules are indispensable to preserve order. It is only thus that the few can control the many. Concession too often means weakness, or is so interpreted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the many desperate characters who crowd a gaol. Nothing is more deeply imprinted in prison history than the need for a firm hand. When the reins are slackened, the team has invariably turned restive and the weakening of authority has ever been attended by far worse evils—aggravated, persistent insubordination, dangerous unrest, outbreaks, overt resistance—than any at which the tender-hearted now rebel. The argument gains in force where numbers are associated together with the increased strength that such numbers give, as in the convict "public works" prisons, Borstal, Dartmoor and Portland. Here a mass of criminality, made up largely of heinous and habitual offenders, are held seemingly by a thread; an armed warder to five and twenty or thirty convicts in the open, beyond bolts and bars, with weapons—tools, pick and shovel and crowbar—in their hands. The real force is impalpable, out of sight, but it is there; it is the unyielding demand for absolute submissiveness, for the surrender of independent volition, the subjection of many wills to one, with the watchful, lynx-eyed, unremitting supervision that secures these objects, backed up by the strong arm to enforce them. It is this discipline—discipline salutary and indispensable, as most officials think—that kindly folks condemn and would relax, having, as I believe, hardly appreciated the reasons for it. The only alternative to it would be to abolish the public works prisons and revert to separation and the solitary cell, which is still more repugnant to the prison reformer.

The discipline has been called "iron-bound" and inordinately severe, but this is surely an exaggeration. It is not borne out by the statistics of offences and punishments. According to the latest figures, 1896-7 (but year after year the totals scarcely vary), there were some 30,000 prison offences committed among a little over 200,000 persons. Of these 30,000, 1,000 were "violence" and assaults made on officers, nearly 9,000 were idleness, 19,000 were other breaches of regulation, such as thefts of food, persistent talking, quarreling, and so forth. There were only fifteen attempts at escape, five in convict and ten in local prisons. For these offences about 15,000 prisoners were punished; and it must be explained that the number of offences and persons punished can never agree, for one and the same individual will commit several offences, and similarly receive several kinds of punishment, for diet deprivations, losses of privilege and cells may be awarded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at one and the same time. The punishments again speak for themselves. The bulk are dietary, reduction in the amount or scale of food, the loss of privilege, of special work, of mattress, of marks earned toward remission of sentence. Corporal punishment was inflicted 131 times, 19 in convict prisons, 112 in local; and in the latter corporal punishment means more frequently the use of the school boy's "birch" than the "cat." Punishment cells were ordered 293 times, twice only in convict prisons, while handcuffs, not as a "punishment" but as a "restraint" to prevent self-inflicted injuries, were employed on 54 occasions. The sum total is scarcely horrifying with a daily average of 17,000 prison population furnished by the coming and going of 200,000 in the year.

Satisfactory facts and figures may also be adduced in regard to the health—bodily and mental both—during and after confinement. It might be supposed from the painful pictures drawn that sanitary conditions and precautions were utterly neglected in gaol. As to this, the best answer is the entire absence of zymotic disease in English prisons. There has not been a single case of enteric fever known for the last dozen years. Drainage and common necessaries are seen to carefully, and if a certain rough and ready system exists in some respects which cannot be discussed, it is no worse than obtains in barracks and warships and wherever people are massed together. As to the care of the sick, prison hospitals keep pace with modern ideas; they defy criticism in respect to food, bedding, medicines and clinical treatment. Prison doctors are for the most part well chosen, capable medical men. Where local practitioners are employed, partly or temporarily, they are persons in good practice, much esteemed in the neighborhood. It must not be forgotten that while the really sick receive every attention, many sham invalids are always bidding for the ease and comparative comfort of the prison hospital, for lighter work and extra diet. No pains are spared to detect disease on admission or to ascertain the fitness of prisoners for labor. Errors in this respect are rare, while those who require medical treatment are never long overlooked. The readiness to admit to hospitals is shown by the number of cases treated during the year—6,548 in local, and 1,865 in convict prisons. The general healthiness of prisons may also be inferred from the low annual death-rate, which in local gaols was 7.4 per 1,000,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in convict prisons 9.7. Except in a very small proportion, these deaths occurred so soon after admission that it is pretty certain the fatal disease originated before they entered prison. It has been advanced against all this that the death rate is kept down by the anticipatory release on medical grounds of all affected with incurable complaints. As a matter of fact, 74 persons were so released in 1896-7 from local prisons, but 44 were women advanced in pregnancy, and the proportion of the balance was no more than 2.2 per 1,000. In the convict prisons there were only 16 released, or 1.4 per 1,000.

By far the gravest charge remains, that of the alleged insanity produced by imprisonment. It has been strongly urged that more or less marked mental degeneracy is the inevitable sequel, particularly in long sentences, although the blame is cast widespread on all terms and all forms of penal treatment. Very elaborate figures have been prepared on this head by Dr. Smalley, H. M. Medical Inspector of Prisons, which, although of extreme importance, would take up too much space if inserted here. Briefly stated, there were, in 1896-7, 164 cases of insanity in local prisons, but of those 121 were insane on arrival. Of the remaining 43, 19 showed symptoms within the first month, and their insanity could scarcely be due to the gaol. The other 24 were made up of 13 who became insane after three months, six within six months, and five after six months, and although with them the gaol might have been the cause, there is no positive evidence to that effect. In the convict prisons the number removed to lunatic asylums was 15—9 males and 6 females. Three males were of doubtful mental condition when first received, another was almost an idiot who had long wandered as a tramp or from workhouse to workhouse, and who became rapidly imbecile; cerebral disease, probably of syphilitic origin, brought on insanity in another; while in the two others evil habits might with reason account for mental failure.

I quoted at the outset Lord Cockburn's dictum that reformation occupies really the second place in any good penal system. His argument is as forcible as ever; nevertheless, as a fact, the endeavor is constantly and earnestly made to improve the offender while expiating his offence, to lead him from evil to good, to persuade him that honesty is the best policy. It is attempted by religious and moral teaching, by technical instruction where it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is possible, by charitable assistance and a helping hand on discharge. Many estimable people hold that more might be done in the direction first named; that by "individualizing" prisoners, taking each case singly and working strenuously it might be possible to "*get hold of a man*" *and convert him from the error* of his ways. All honor must be paid to such theories, but in practice they necessarily fail, if for no other reason than that the period is generally too short during which these high influences can be brought to bear. The large proportion of committals to English prisons is for the very briefest space of time. Seventy-five per cent. of the whole number of prisoners received during the year are for terms under fourteen days, and more than half of these are for less than seven days. Take off the days of reception and discharge, which under our English system do not count, and a maximum of three, four, or five days makes up the entire period spent in gaol by thousands. What can precept or ghostly counsel accomplish in that time? The same fatal obstacle interposes against "moralization by labor." It has been thought that if detention were more largely utilized in the teaching of trades and handicrafts, the ex-prisoner might be helped to earn an honest living for himself when at large. What amount of skill can be acquired in a week or a fortnight, nay, in six months, or even in a year? Is the taxpayer, who has already suffered from criminal depredations, to be further mulcted in the heavy charges for waste of materials and injury to tools entailed in the apprenticeship? Yet the effort is even now made to the utmost extent possible. All prisoners with long terms are employed in useful and remunerative labor, and many do gain a certain industrial knowledge. The scope is somewhat limited; prisoners may learn shoemaking, tailoring, the trade of the tinsmith, rough carpentering, to bind books, ply the needle, lay bricks; but few, if any, gain high proficiency, and such half skilled workmen in these days of keen competition do not easily find employment when free, while the trades unions look more and more askance at the state-bred artisan.

Such facts as these are discouraging and should warn the most sanguine against expecting too much from such processes. But it is right that the great work of reformation should still be attempted by all possible means. Good would probably follow some relaxation of discipline where terms are prolonged, in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direction of relieving convict life of some of its darkest and grimmest features. It has been strongly urged of late that the gray, colorless monotony of existence year after year, always in durance, with freedom a long way off, perpetual toil, all in gruesome surroundings, tend to degradation and despair. Man is beyond question a highly adaptive creature. After a certain time he will grow accustomed to most things, even to the semi-monasticism of convict life, with all its self-effacement and irksome penalties. Yet, to let in a little brightness, to permit more frequent communication with friends by letter and visit, to raise the curtain that so hopelessly screens off the outer world, would react favorably upon the felon, humanizing him, softening him, helping him to change his nature instead of stiffening it into continued hostility to the law that has got him in its grip. The primary importance of deterrence has been fully set forth in these remarks, but the times are changing, and even prison administrators may also come to change their views. We may see great concessions made to all kinds of prisoners in the years to come. Provided the change is introduced gradually and cautiously, the experiment of enlarging privileges, of allowing lectures, newspapers, a few creature comforts—even tobacco—may yet be tried, and with results that may be beneficial.

ARTHUR GRIFFITHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEWARD'S IDEAS OF TERRITORIAL EXPANSION.

BY FREDERIC BANCROFT.

IT is a common illusion that history never repeats itself. To most persons the large events of each week seem like a revelation, the wranglings and twistings of politics are unprecedented, the blaze and passion of war are as thoroughly novel as the discovery of a new application of electricity. At a matter of fact, repetition is the rule rather than the exception. Similar conditions recur in every decade or generation, and almost the same results are produced in each instance. He knows little about our civil war who has not been interested by phases of that struggle which have recurred in recent experience, and yet it would be difficult to imagine two wars less alike superficially. Several of the old heroes have reappeared with new names and in strange surroundings. The McClellans and the Fremonts are on the way. Grant and Sheridan and Sherman may not be needed, but the days of furious criticism of the President's *post-bellum* policy, whatever it may be, are sure to come.

Likewise men talk of territorial expansion as if it were a new problem. It is new only in some phases; in others it is older than the century. If dreamers and bigots could be disregarded, it would not be difficult for the liberal-minded people to argue and to come to an agreement upon a policy that would be both safe and progressive. The question is not whether we are to expand—for that is a matter of course, if we govern ourselves wisely for half a century longer; but it is: When, how and where can we extend our boundaries advantageously to our national welfare? What we need now is information and rational speculation as to ways and means in relation to actual and prospective conditions.

Seward was by far the best type of those who favored expansion in the last generation. He was a man of facts as well as of imagina-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. The late Charles A. Dana once remarked in giving me some recollections of the great Secretary of State: "Seward's imagination was a trait that has rarely been noticed. It led him to the theoretical conclusion that the future capital of North America would be in the City of Mexico. I think that the purchase of Alaska was his greatest work in diplomacy; that was a practical expression of his imagination." Some of Seward's opinions about future territorial acquisitions were due to party consideration, but others were so prophetic as to be almost startling; and nearly all his thoughts on the subject have a peculiar interest to us now. Forty-six years ago he said in the Senate in discussing the commerce of the Pacific:

"Even the discovery of this continent and its islands, and the organization of society and government upon them, grand and important as these events have been, were but conditional, preliminary, and ancillary to the more sublime result, now in the act of consummation—the reunion of the two civilizations, which, having parted on the plains of Asia four thousand years ago, and having travelled ever afterward in opposite directions around the world, now meet again on the coasts and islands of the Pacific Ocean. Certainly, no mere human event of equal dignity and importance has ever occurred upon the earth. It will be followed by the equalization of the condition of society and the restoration of the unity of the human family. We see plainly enough why this event could not have come before, and why it has come now. A certain amount of human freedom, a certain amount of human intelligence, a certain extent of human control over the physical obstacles to such a reunion, was necessary. All the conditions have happened and occurred. Liberty has developed under improved forms of government, and science has subjected Nature in Western Europe and in America. Navigation, improved by steam, enables men to outstrip the winds, and intelligence conveyed by electricity excels in velocity the light. With these favoring circumstances there has come also a sudden abundance of gold, that largely relieves labor from its long subjection to realized capital. Sir, this movement is no delusion."

In 1850 he spoke of "the strifes yet to come over ice-bound regions beyond the St. Lawrence and sunburnt plains beneath the tropics."

From the time when the colonies began their movement for independence there has been an almost constant tendency toward expansion. The century and a quarter has been divided into three periods of about equal length. The considerations urged in the different periods have had hardly any relation to one another. At first the questions were, how to establish independence through united action, and then how to give the new nation a chance to develop its resources. During about forty years prior to the civil war the interests of slavery influenced nearly every thought of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expansion and almost every problem in foreign relations. Since that war many have maintained that coaling stations and fortified harbors in different parts of the world are absolutely necessary to the proper maintenance and effectiveness of a navy.

In the earliest period it was confidently expected that all the British Colonies on the continent would unite in the struggle for independence. Franklin's plan of 1775 contemplated that Quebec, St. John's, Nova Scotia, East and West Florida, and the Bermuda Islands could be enlisted in the cause. Persistent efforts were made to induce Canada to act with the American colonies. Adams, Franklin and others believed that without a union of all the colonies from the Gulf of Mexico northward, there could be no lasting peace. As late as 1785 John Adams wrote: "Canada and Nova Scotia must soon be ours; there must be a war for it; they know how it will end, but the sooner the better; this done we shall be forever at peace; till then, never." But the real difficulties appeared in the opposite direction.

All our rivers flowing into the Gulf passed through foreign territory. Spain then owned Florida and Louisiana. In 1800 Louisiana was ceded back to France. The interests of the settlers in the Ohio valley forbade that a European government should long command the natural entrance to this region. Most of the surviving leaders of the Revolution favored the acquisition of Louisiana territory or admitted that it was almost necessary. In order to control the mouth of the Mississippi we purchased in 1803, not merely what we needed, but a vast tract that was not much prized at the time. There was a dispute as to whether what was known as West Florida, and held by Spain, had been re-ceded to France in 1800 and was therefore included in our purchase. The United States maintained the affirmative and made their claim good by taking possession in 1810. Meantime a strong sentiment had developed in the South favorable to the acquisition of East Florida by whatever means might be necessary. Realizing from repeated invasions from the United States that East Florida could not be protected, Spain sold it in 1819.

There had also been a dispute about the boundary between Texas and Louisiana. Texas was vast, rich, and especially attractive to Southerners. At first the idea of getting more territory for slavery was little thought of. Henry Clay and Van Buren, as Secretaries of State to John Quincy Adams and Jackson respect-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ively, endeavored to purchase it of Mexico. Adams, who had approved Clay's offer in 1827, introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives, in 1838, declaring that any attempt to annex Texas "by act of Congress or by treaty would be a usurpation of power, unlawful, and void, and which it would be the right and the duty of the free people of the Union to resist and annul." By the time of the Presidential campaign of 1844 nearly every one in the South was bent on adding Texas to our domain, while all the anti-slavery and most of the Whig sentiment of the North was opposed to it. The Democrats won, and annexation was said to have been ordered by the people. As it was doubtful whether two-thirds of the Senate would vote for a treaty to carry out the so-called order, Congress proceeded by joint resolution; the President acted promptly, and the United States troops were soon ready to protect Texas. Then they moved forward to disputed territory and precipitated a war with Mexico. Our army of invasion was so overpowering that in 1848 Mexico was glad to sell California and New Mexico for $15,000,000, rather than risk losing this sum, and still more territory. Robert J. Walker, who was Polk's Secretary of the Treasury, stated in writing several years later, that the reason a larger portion of Mexico was not taken was because it was feared that to acquire more might prevent making slave States of even California and New Mexico. A dispute about the southern boundary of New Mexico was settled by the payment of $10,000,000 for a strip of about 45,000 square miles of Mexican territory.

Seward had made a close study of the political forces and the tendencies of civilization on this continent, and his judgments were generally accurate. In 1853 he said:

"This century has thus far exhibited two political processes, continually going on upon this continent. The first, that of general decolonization; and the second, that of a decay of Spanish-American power, and the aggrandizement of the United States of America. Spain ceded Louisiana to France in 1800, and in 1803 France conveyed it to the United States. Apprehensions were felt at that early day in New Spain (Mexico) that the United States might advance so as to encroach upon that territory; and these apprehensions were fearfully confirmed when the United States, having first taken possession of portions of the provinces of Florida, obtained in 1819, a relinquishment of them by Spain. Texas was for a time uninhabited, and seemed to promise that it would remain a barrier for New Spain or Mexico, against the United States. Becoming rapidly peopled, nevertheless, Texas asserted its independence; and then the hopes of Mexico, for its own security and safety, rested upon the chance that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Texas might remain an independent power, or put itself under the sovereignty of some European State, which would prevent its annexation to the United States. But these expectations signally failed; and, in 1845, Texas came into the United States, with possessions then understood by most of us to reach only to the river Nueces. The war with Mexico, which grew chiefly out of that annexation, and out of the attending border question, resulted, as we all know, in the direct dismemberment of Mexico, and the annexation to the United States of what remained to Mexico of the State of Texas, together with the States of New Mexico and Upper California, by which the United States advanced to the bank of the Rio Grande, and across the continent to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

. . . The United States, from the first, or from an early day, determined that there should be no European colonial power remaining on this continent which they could prevent or remove, and therefore they fostered a spirit of revolt in Mexico; and when Mexico, in her revolution or after her revolution of 1821, arrived at the point where she must definitely choose her form of government the United States recommeded to her, with success, the principles of Federal republicanism, which were adopted."

Assuming that all the States of Mexico might be soon annexed to the United States, he put these very pointed questions to those who recklessly insisted that what was likely to come some time might well come at once:

"Those states cannot govern themselves now; can they govern themselves better after they are annexed to the United States? No. Will you govern them? Pray, tell me how. By admitting them as equals, or by proconsular power? If the one, you must have an army perpetually there to suppress insurrection. If the other, still you must have a standing army in the provinces, ultimately to come back and open the same disastrous drama of anarchy, civil war, desolation, and ruin at home, which the armies of Mexico have enacted there. If you bring them in as States, have you settled the question whether you are to govern them, or whether they are to exercise self-government, and so govern you? . . .

"These are no idle questions. They are coming upon us, and they will be here when Mexico, exhausted by internal factions, and by resistance to your own suggestions, shall implore you to give her rest, and peace, and safety, by admitting her to your confederacy, as before long, in any event, she surely must and will do. That time is coming soon enough without hastening it. Why hasten it? You answer that you want a passage across the continent by way of Tehuantepec. Have you not more passages already across your own domain to open than you can open in twenty-five years? Have you not more land already than you can people in fifty years? Have you not more gold and silver than you can dig in a hundred years? These dangers are real, but only real if precipitated. Time will speedily fill the regions which you already possess with a homogeneous population and homogeneous States; yet even long before that event, so soon to arrive, shall have come, this nation will have acquired such magnitude, such consistency, such strength, such unity, such empire, that Mexico, with her one million of whites, her two millions of mixed races, and her five millions of Aztecs and other aborigines, can be received and absorbed without disturbing the national harmony, impairing the national vigor, or even checking, for a day, the national progress."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That is, he favored expansion, but expansion merely in proportion to our capacity for absorption.

Purely sectional or political interests were in control when the acquisition of Cuba and of Canada was discussed at different times during the fifteen years prior to the civil war. It was mainly a struggle for the balance of power in the United States Senate. Some of the wisest public men since the early part of this century had believed that Cuba should be annexed at the first opportunity. Jefferson thought it desirable because it could be defended without a navy. In 1823 John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State, declared that Porto Rico and Cuba were natural appendages to this continent, and that Cuba had become an object of transcendent importance to the commercial and political interests of our Union. He believed that it would naturally gravitate to the United States when released from Spain. Polk endeavored in vain to purchase it. After the election of Pierce the Democrats made its acquisition one of their chief aims. They tried negotiation, but when that gave no promise of success, they threatened and argued themselves into believing that we had a right to seize the island if Spain would not sell it. In 1853 Senator Hale, of New Hampshire, called for extension northward, for a change, and moved to substitute the word "Canada" in place of "Cuba" in a resolution expressing sentiments favorable to our getting possession of that island.

Seward and many other anti-slavery men would not have opposed annexations on the South if they had not felt bound to do all they could to prevent an increase in the number of slave States. The New York Senator's most skilful tactics were barely sufficient to stem the tide on one or two occasions. Argument was avoided and ridicule and delays were introduced wherever possible. In 1859 the rivalry was between getting a vote on a homestead bill and a bill to buy Cuba. Seward made a telling epigram by saying that the question was one about lands for the landless freemen of the United States, as against one about slaves for the slaveholders of the United States. Wade called forth loud applause by condensing the idea into the inquiry, "Shall we give niggers to the niggerless or lands to the landless?" Shrewd Republican leadership and the growing excitement over domestic politics, especially in relation to affairs in Kansas and the John Brown raid upon Harper's Ferry, prevented the Democrats from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finding a way for the United States to secure the coveted island. At different times Seward showed that he expected this whole continent ultimately to become the possession of the United States. He was so confident of it that he did not wish it to be brought about hastily or by war. In 1846 he wrote to a political convention:

"I want no war. I want no enlargement of territory, sooner than it would come if we were contented with 'a masterly inactivity.' I abhor war, as I detest slavery. I would not give one human life for all the continent that remains to be *annexed*. But I cannot exclude the conviction, that the popular passion for territorial aggrandizement is irresistible. Prudence, justice, cowardice, may check it for a season, but it will gain strength by its subjugation. An American navy is hovering over Vera Cruz. An American army is at the heart of what was once Mexico. . . . Our population is destined to roll its resistless waves to the icy barriers of the north, and to encounter oriental civilization on the shores of the Pacific. The monarchs of Europe are to have no rest while they have a colony remaining on this continent. France has already sold out. Spain has sold out. We shall see how long before England inclines to follow their example. It behooves us then, to qualify orselves for our mission. We must dare our destiny."

Speaking at St. Paul in the campaign of 1860, he said:

"Standing here and looking far off into the northwest, I see the Russian as he busily occupies himself in establishing seaports, and towns, and fortifications, on the verge of this continent, as the outposts of St. Petersburg, and I can say, 'Go on and build up your outposts all along the coast, up even to the Arctic Ocean—they will yet become the outposts of my own country—monuments of the civilization of the United States in the northwest.' So I look off on Prince Rupert's Land and Canada, and see there an ingenious, enterprising and ambitious people, occupied with bridging rivers and constructing canals, railroads and telegraphs, to organize and preserve great British provinces north of the great lakes, the St. Lawrence, and around the shores of Hudson Bay, and I am able to say, 'It is very well, you are building excellent states to be hereafter admitted into the American Union.' I can look southwest and see amid all the convulsions that are breaking the Spanish-American republics and in their rapid decay and dissolution, the preparatory stage for their reorganization in free, equal and self-governing members of the United States of America."

After the Republican victory of 1860 there was no longer any possibility of acquiring territory in the interests of slavery. Seward became Secretary of State, and was therefore in a position to express with more effect his ideas of territorial expansion.

Everybody knows in a general way the numerous difficulties that confronted Lincoln's administration in March, 1861, and how procrastination and indecision were forced upon it. The radical Republicans wanted to reenforce Fort Sumter and elsewhere assert the national authority with vigor. Seward pleaded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for delay, believing that the Confederacy would soon collapse if dealt with peacefully and patiently. But the influence of the coercionists grew stronger, and by the end of March he saw that there was no longer any chance for his original policy. Just at that time it was learned that Spain had taken advantage of a revolutionary movement in the Republic of Santo Domingo and had raised her flag. It was also known that Great Britain, France and Spain were contemplating intervention in Mexico for the purpose of obtaining indemnities for past losses and perhaps to overthrow the republican government and to establish a monarchy under European protection. There was a strong suspicion that Russia was very friendly toward the Confederacy. Seward thought he saw an opportunity to escape a civil war by getting up a foreign one, between the Governments of Central and North America on one side and one or more European powers on the other. So, on April 1, he gave Lincoln a written outline of a policy for both foreign and domestic affairs. As to the former he said:

"I would demand explanations from Spain and France categorically, at once. I would seek explanation from Great Britain and Russia, and send agents into Canada, Mexico, and Central America to raise a vigorous continental spirit of independence on this continent against European intervention, and if satisfactory explanations are not received from Spain and France, [I] would convene Congress and declare war against them."

It is relevant here to assume the possibility of the consummation of this plan, and to imagine the result. If the Confederacy had forgotten its purposes and joined the continental movement, then there would have been a war in which the United States would have led the different peoples from the Isthmus to Hudson's Bay against two or more European nations. If the forces of the Western Hemisphere had won, the United States would probably have become the head of a vast confederation. Every one can speculate for himself as to what a grand, prosperous and stable government this mammoth confederation would, or would not, have been. Lincoln seems to have had a very decided prejudice in favor of keeping his eyes on domestic dangers, of executing the laws and of looking after the property of the United States. So he politely rejected Seward's suggestions *in toto*, and ordered the preparation of expeditions for the relief of Forts Sumter and Pickens.

Excepting an offer, shortly after this time, to buy Lower California of Mexico, Seward had no time or opportunity to think of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expansion until near the end of the civil war. In searching for blockade-runners and pursuing Confederate commerce-destroyers our naval officers had almost constantly lamented the lack of a harbor in the West Indies, where supplies could be kept, prizes taken and repairs made. Such a harbor would have been a great saving of time and money, and it would have been in no danger of seizure by the Confederates. So Seward looked about for an acquisition.

Denmark had been especially friendly to the United States since the war began. She owned three small islands near the eastern end of the West Indies—St. Thomas, St. John and Santa Cruz. St. Thomas was a central point for a very large portion of the commerce between North and South America, and between Europe and the ports of the Caribbean Sea. High naval authority then and since that time have pronounced it to be one of the best keys to the West Indies, and to command all of them. Admiral Porter called it "a small Gibraltar of itself," and said that there would be no possibility of landing troops there, for the island was surrounded by reefs and breakers, and every point near which a vessel or a boat could approach was a natural fortification that could be defended with guns and a little labor. The harbor is one of the best in the West Indies. In January, 1866, Seward made a careful inspection of St. Thomas and several other islands. The question was merely one of naval expediency, so far as Denmark's possessions were concerned. St. Thomas's area was only twenty-three square miles and its population was about fourteen thousand, and St. John's size was but two square miles less and its population numbered not quite one thousand. Santa Cruz had a population of eighteen thousand and an area of seventy-four square miles.

The negotiations had begun early in 1865. After some long delays the sum of $7,500,000 was agreed upon as the price for St. Thomas and St. John. The inhabitants of St. Thomas voted almost unanimously for annexation. Denmark completed her part of the understanding, but before this had occurred the angry strife between Johnson and Congress had broken out, and Seward had become very unpopular on account of his support of the President. Moreover, an earthquake and a hurricane spread desolation over the island, just at the most unfavorable time. The project was easily ridiculed. The Senate did not even take a vote

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on ratifying the treaty. Johnson's administration expired and Grant's was unwilling to adopt Seward's work.

Meantime the Secretary of State had endeavored to purchase of Santo Domingo the peninsula and Gulf of Samana for naval purposes. Later on Santo Domingo asked to be annexed to the United States. Seward endeavored to develop sentiment in favor of this. He also wished to bring Hawaii into the Union. But public attention was so much engrossed in domestic questions, and Congress was so ill-disposed toward the administration, that none of these aims could be realized.

In one case, however, by tact and expedition, Seward was able to overcome all obstacles. In the Kansas-Nebraska debate early in 1854 he had asked: "What territories, even if we are able to buy or conquer them from Great Britain or Russia, will the slave-holding States suffer, much less aid, us to annex, to restore the equilibrium?" The idea of annexing Alaska was not original with him; both Polk and Buchanan had taken some steps in that direction, but neither was very eager. After the end of the war, when Seward was thinking of national expansion, he naturally turned to Russia, who had been our most valuable friend when there was danger of a war with France and Great Britain. There was no special theory as to any necessity of obtaining possession of Alaska. Its area was about nine-tenths that of the whole United States in 1783. Its nearest point was four hundred miles, and its most remote one about five times that far, from the United States.

To acquire so remote a territory was a startling change from previous practices in adding to our domain. Although it was not generally supposed that Alaska would ever be very valuable except on account of its fisheries and fur-bearing animals, it was recognized that $7,200,000 was not a large sum to pay, even if we obtained, as Seward's detractors said, merely a land of polar bears and eternal winters. The Secretary himself was fully conscious of Alaska's great resources. Everyone saw that there was no political risk involved. The population was sparse, and outside of a few settlements of thrifty Russians, it was entirely Indian. It was a foregone conclusion that if it increased, it would become thoroughly American; and if it remained as it was, or decreased, it could cause no serious difficulty. All are now agreed as to the wisdom of the purchase of Alaska.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of all the truly great and patriotic statesmen of our history, Seward is among the last to be taken as an infallible guide. He had a great passion to be brilliant, original and dashing; ordinary ideas had no charm for him. Some of his expressions in relation to expansion, if understood otherwise than as political philosophizing about a distant future, may be tinder in a time like the present. Other ideas of his are sober and may be very useful when we have to consider some new factors in the old question of national expansion.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GREATER NEW YORK'S WATER SUPPLY.

BY F. B. THURBER.

WHEN the New Croton Aqueduct was completed a few years ago, it was generally understood that an ample water supply, for many years, had been secured for New York; although it was known that Brooklyn was approaching the danger limit, and that with her rapidly increasing population, an additional water supply would soon be absolutely necessary. In his inaugural message, Mayor Van Wyck said:

"A most serious public necessity is presented by the problem in the solution of which the city is to be accommodated with a sufficient water supply. Especially in the Borough of Brooklyn is the adequacy of the quantity of water, available through present facilities, a matter of grave complaint.

"Early in December last, in a communication addressed to the Mayor of Brooklyn, the then Commissioner of City Works thus described the situation:

"'The careful investigations prosecuted under my predecessor, and actively continued during my administration, show, and it is a matter of public record, that the available supply from the present watershed, even if developed to its utmost estimated capacity, would not be sufficient to carry us beyond the end of the present century, and that an additional water supply from new sources should be procured and be ready for use at the beginning of 1900. It has also been reported by this Department, and is a matter of public record, that the intervening time was scarcely sufficient to construct the work necessary to procure such additional supply. Lastly, it has also been repeatedly stated and published that the limit of the present supply would be shortened in proportion to the delay in carrying out the works planned for the development of the watershed or curtailment of the same, so that the city might find itself without an adequate supply long before the end of the present century. Owing to the absolute failure to provide means for the execution of the works referred to, the limit of the present supply has now been reached, and we are depending mainly on favorable weather conditions to carry us through, and are compelled to resort to risky and destructive expedients to bridge over a most critical situation.'

"Not only in the Borough of Brooklyn is the water supply a question of great anxiety, but even in the Borough of Manhattan the situation, if not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alarming, is certainly deserving of most serious consideration. The all-important interests of health and safety involved require that the sufficiency both of the watershed and the facilities for distribution should be placed beyond all dispute."

The importance not only of an increased supply of water, but also of a dual supply, so that if one is disabled the other can temporarily supply pressing wants, has long been recognized. At the instance of prominent merchants the Legislature authorized the commissioners of the Sinking Fund to contract for such a supply.* Various petitions have been submitted to the commissioners of the Sinking Fund to this end, and hearings have been had. Specimens of the petitions are as follows:

"We, the undersigned merchants and citizens doing business in the City of New York, respectfully call your attention to the alarming insufficiency of the present supply of water, and the great danger of destructive conflagrations in the business portion of the city. Each fire that occurs demonstrates the necessity of an independent supply, under sufficient pressure, to meet the requirements of the Fire Department in extinguishing fires in high buildings. In view of these facts we respectfully petition your Honorable Board to take such action as may be necessary to ascertain if an adequate supply from some new and independent source can be obtained that will be delivered to this city in the necessary quantity, and under sufficient pressure, available at all times for the protection of our property; and if such supply is obtainable, that you take the necessary steps as early as possible to secure the same, and thus further the well-being, safety and prosperity of the city."

This was signed by H. B. Claflin & Co., Dunham, Buckley & Co., J. W. Goddard & Sons, Sweetser, Pembrook & Co., Tefft, Weller & Co., Faulkner & Co., Lesher, Whitman & Co., Morrison, Herriman & Co., John F. Plummer & Co., Bliss, Fabyan & Co., Russell & Erwin Mfg. Co., Peck, Stowe & Wilcox Co., Thurber, Whyland & Co., Sargent & Co., Acker, Merrall & Condit, Huntington, Hopkins & Co., Garner & Co., Harper & Brothers, Hoyt Brothers, and The American News Company.

The following is an extract from still another petition to the Sinking Fund Commissioners by the Committee on Water Supply of the New York Board of Fire Underwriters:

"It is hardly necessary for us to remind you, gentlemen, of the urgent and pressing need of an immediate addition to the present supply of water in this city, and of the danger to which property is exposed in consequence of the limited quantity of water and inadequate pressure which the Croton aqueduct affords; these are matters familiar to you all, and have been sufficiently urged before you by merchants and underwriters."

* Chap. 512, Laws o 1883, and Chap. 292, Laws of 1884.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The desirability of a special fire service was, at the time of the agitation in 1886 and 1887, carefully considered and advocated by B. S. Church, Chief Engineer of the Aqueduct Commission, G. W. Birdsall, Chief Engineer of the Croton Aqueduct, and Julius W. Adams, Consulting Engineer of the Department of Public Works; also by A. Fteley, Engineer of the Aqueduct Board, Clemence Herschell, Civil Engineer, and F. W. Simons, Engineer of the U. S. Army, who made a statement September 15, 1887, including the following:

"The lack of pressure in the pipes in a larger part of the city is a matter distinct from that of the available amount of water on hand, and is no less to be considered, and calls for the promptest relief. At its best the extreme available pressure from the Croton Water Works is not very great (119 feet above tide at the Central Park reservoir), and it is insufficient to give a very good fire protection, and to supply several high service districts within the city limits which are supplied by pumping stations. To do away with these pumping stations, and instead to supply all the high service districts from one central source, of a proper and sufficient elevation, would result in a notable economy to the city. . . .

"Besides the value of such an additional supply for fire protection and for economical ends, there is still another point of view. . . . This point of view is the great necessity and desirability of supplying a dual system to a city of the size of New York. There can be no doubt that the danger of a water famine, with its attendant horrors and losses, would be very materially lessened if New York had two independent sources of supply, separated beyond the city limits by the Hudson River. Whether the injury to one system of water supply be due to natural causes, to military occupation or to mob rule, it is but an elementary principle of business to provide duplicate means for the avoidance of disaster."

At one of the hearings Mr. John H. Washburn, President of the New York Board of Underwriters, submitted an exhaustive statement, eloquent in facts, among which was a table showing the daily consumption *per capita* in thirty of the principal cities of the United States, ranging from 252 gallons down to 95 gallons, *that of New York being the lowest of all.*

Nothing came from these representations; the public seemed to think that the new aqueduct would furnish a sufficient water supply and a waiting policy was adopted. Meantime, the problem in Brooklyn had been steadily growing. In December, 1896, a petition of the commercial and manufacturing interests of that city was presented to the Mayor and Board of Aldermen, urging the necessity of an additional water supply. A series of public hearings were given, at which much interesting matter was developed. At one of these Mr. George A. Stanton, representing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important insurance interests, made a statement, of which the following is a part:

"I have taken the trouble, as I have been interested in these questions, to consult an eminent hydraulic engineer. Let us talk this matter over fairly. We have continuously discussed this question of Brooklyn's water supply for years past as if Brooklyn was an immense village, instead of a city of 1,200,000 inhabitants. I have heard it stated by members of the Manufacturers' Association that in ten years, instead of needing 100,000,000 gallons of water we shall want 150,000,000 gallons *per diem*.

"This hydraulic engineer has made several estimates for me, based upon the condition that 100 pounds pressure shall be produced on the water mains of Brooklyn by the new supply. The figures are not only interesting, but very instructive at this time.

"Much has been said about Lake George as a possible source. Lake George has an elevation above tide-level of 343 feet. A tunnel from Lake George to Sandy Hill, 60,000 feet in length, would be required to go under the dividing ridge between the Lake George watershed and the valley of the Hudson River. After the water was delivered into the Hudson Valley it would flow by gravity to tide-level at New York, but would then have to be pumped again to an elevation of 300 feet. The cost of such water works, including pumping machinery, capitalized at four per cent., would be $74,250,000, or equivalent to a net cost of $110 per 1,000,000 gallons of water supplied daily.

"Lake Champlain has been mentioned. The elevation of Lake Champlain is 100 feet above tide-level. It would require (without pumping until tide-level was reached) a tunnel 300,000 feet in length between the lake and Troy, where all the water would have to be pumped 250 feet high in order to have it reach tide-level at New York by gravity. Then it would have to be pumped again 300 feet high. The cost of this plant, including the pumping machinery, capitalized at four per cent., would be $105,325,000, or equivalent to $145 per 1,000,000 gallons.

"Lake Ontario has also been brought into this question. The elevation of Lake Ontario above tide-water is 247 feet. A conduit from this lake to Albany, without pumping, would require a tunnel 930,000 feet long; and from such a conduit the water could be delivered 20 feet above tide-level at Albany. There it would have to be pumped 230 feet high in order to flow by gravity to tide-level at New York, where it would again be pumped 300 feet high. The cost of such a plant, including pumping machinery, capitalized at four per cent., would be $132,135,000, equivalent to $190 per 1,000,000 gallons.

"Now, the question has been brought up in the Legislature, as to another source of water supply—*viz.*, the Adirondacks. Another engineer has made calculations, independent entirely of those made by the gentleman to whom I have referred, and whose figures I have quoted. If I were to mention his name in this room to-day, you would recognize it as one of national reputation. In a conversation with him by a friend of mine, this engineer stated, within the past ten days, that, in his opinion, to build the retaining reservoirs at the altitude necessary to give the pressure at the city line in New York or Brooklyn, and to build the conduits necessary to furnish the supply from the Adirondacks, the cost would be somewhere between $200,000,000 and $250,000,000. As to time, three years, at least, would be required to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secure the necessary legislation and to make preliminary surveys, before putting a spade into the ground. The matter would have to be submitted to popular vote in addition to the authorization of the Legislature, which authorization would require an additional year. To build the conduits and reservoirs would require at least five years, and it would then be accomplished only by letting out the work in contracts of twenty-five miles each, so that construction on ten or more contracts could proceed simultaneously.

"Now, it strikes me that if we are going to discuss this matter intelligently, we must look at the question as to where Brooklyn stands to-day as to its resources, before being a party to such a great work as this. Has Brooklyn the means to do this or not? Has any provision been made so that the city of Brooklyn can participate in so large an expenditure of money for a water supply? As I understand it, Brooklyn is within $500,000 of its debt limit, and, therefore, it cannot be supposed that Brooklyn will undertake this. Do you, gentlemen, suppose for one moment that the people in the western section of this State are going to see a State debt incurred for the benefit of the cities of New York and Brooklyn of $200,000,000 or $250,000,000? I think not. The debt of the State of New York to-day is not over $7,000,000 or $8,000,000.

"What, then, is the city of Brooklyn to do? It has got to do one of two things: Either it has got to rely upon itself and see itself go down, or else it must seek outside for some method or plan so that it can purchase its water. There is no other way out of the difficulty. I have studied this matter for months. I believe in municipal ownership if we can get it; but I cannot see for myself where there is any loophole out of this question but to get our water from somebody else."

The discussion continued in the press, and the Committee on Water and Drainage of the Board of Aldermen of Brooklyn was instructed to take testimony on the subject; and on December 30, 1897, made a report, of which the following are salient points:

"The importance of the subject of greatly and permanently increased water supply, and the general interest which it appears to have excited, are indicated by a few sentences of the petition of the merchants, and the letter from the Real Estate Exchange above referred to. We quote:

"'We, the undersigned merchants, manufacturers, owners of property, and rent payers, desire respectfully to call your attention to the subject of Brooklyn's water supply and the falling pressure from the water pipes, and to urge upon you the great necessity for some speedy action which shall place the first and proper interest for the comfort, safety, and health of this great city beyond the dangers that have almost annually threatened us from water shortage.

"'There is abundant official recognition of insufficient water supply and anxiety for the immediate future.

"'There is no further supply available on Long Island.

"'Chapter 942, of the Laws of 1896, provides that the Board of Supervisors of Suffolk County may "decide that certain streams and ponds within such county are necessary for the supply of pure and wholesome water to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people residing in such county," and may "direct a certificate to that effect to be duly signed and acknowledged by the Chairman and Clerk of said Board, and cause the same to be recorded in the office of the Clerk of said County."

"'The law also provides that after the recording of such certificate no person, corporation or municipality can lawfully take water from the ponds and streams mentioned therein for the purpose of supplying it to any city outside the county. The Board of Supervisors of that county have so decided and fully availed themselves of the benefits of the statutes and excluded Brooklyn from the use of waters from their territory.'

"At the second hearing Chief Engineer Milne made statements regarding the condition which, as he understood it, then confronted the City Works Department in this matter:

"'Question: Is Suffolk County excluded from your rights by law?

"'Mr. Milne: I am so informed; by legislative enactment.

"'Question: I so understand it, that the city is not permitted to enter Suffolk County for the purpose of obtaining water. Well, have all known means of reaching the greatest supply that can be obtained from Queens County been adopted and put into execution?

"'Mr. Milne: I believe they have.'

"No relief can be obtained from New York or the Greater New York.

"The possibility of securing any temporary assistance by the loan of water from the Croton supply appears to have been settled by the following official statements as to the present and prospective restrictions which are experienced by New York, contained in a letter written by Mr. Alphonse Fteley, Chief Engineer of the Aqueduct Commission of New York City, in reply to questions in writing by Chief Engineer Milne:

"'When the new Croton dam, Cornell's, is built, thereby completing the storage system of the Croton River watershed, it is estimated that the capacity of the works will average 280,000,000 gallons per day in a dry year. The new Croton dam will require five years for its completion. In the meantime we have hardly storage enough to meet the present consumption, which at the present time is 225,000,000 gallons per day from the Croton watershed. It is expected that the opening of the new mains now being laid from the Central Park reservoir through the lower part of the city will cause a daily increase of 25,000,000 gallons.

"'At the rate that the consumption has been increased since the opening of the new aqueduct in 1890, when the consumption was 115,000,000 gallons daily, New York will require all the water that the construction of the new Croton dam will procure at the time of its completion. New sources of supply will consequently be needed in the near future, and investigations should now be begun in that direction.

"'For the reasons above given, it is clear that New York could not supply Brooklyn with any amount of water in five years from now.'

"Engineer of Water Supply de Varona stated in his report to this Committee a similar result from his own inquiries, as follows:

"'I am led from the data in my possession, and from my correspondence with the Chief Engineer of the Croton Aqueduct, to infer that the city of New York cannot spare for our use any portion of their supply from their present sources.'

"A supply from new sources, to be delivered in 1900, and sufficient for a term of years thereafter, is now imperatively demanded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"In his annual message to the Common Council, submitted January 4, 1897, Mayor Wurster said:

"'I am heartily in favor of action being taken looking toward a lasting supply.'

"A requisite supply is available on the mainland.

"The testimony given at our hearings, and the official reports of the City Works Department during the term of Commissioner White, indicate that a sufficient supply can be secured on the mainland, either from the Housatonic River (Ten Mile Creek), the Ramapo River, the Catskill Mountains, Lake George, the Adirondacks, or the Great Lakes. The first two of the possible sources were reported upon by Commissioner White. Each of the others is said to afford ample quantity. Hence it seems to become a question of securing water from some one of them by contracting with private corporations or individuals.

"Regarding such an effort toward obtaining a supply, but without reference to the city's financial condition, his Honor, Mayor Wurster, is reported to have spoken as follows in an interview published on February 27, 1896:

"The Mayor was then asked if he believed it would be more advisable to buy the water supply for the city outright than to secure it by leasing of water privileges. In reply, he said:

"'It is purely a matter of business. If it can be shown that the city can buy water cheaper than the cost of pumping it, then it would be profitable to buy it, for under such an agreement the seller would have to deliver the water to the city. It is a purely business matter, the same as if a man in one line of business required certain material in conducting that business. If he could buy it from a man who has the plant for manufacturing it, at a less cost than it would be for him to manufacture it himself, he would not be much of a business man if he did not avail himself of the opportunity to buy the material.'

"The conclusion is, therefore, plain that the minimum yield of our watershed will be absorbed in less than three years and the maximum yield will be practically mortgaged in less time than was originally contemplated.

"Three plans for additional water supply were submitted to the Hon. A. T. White, late Commissioner of City Works, each based upon the idea of furnishing one hundred millions of gallons of water in twenty-four hours. The first comprises a watershed on Long Island east of the present shed. The second referred to the Ramapo watershed, located on the west side of the Hudson River in the State of New York; and the third to the Ten Mile River watershed, a branch of the Housatonic, in the State of New York.

"As to the first plan: The scheme of it involves the extension of the present system to the east on the same general basis of scope and design. The cost of construction, however, is estimated to be more than either of the others. Such cost is inevitably due to the necessity of pumping, to the sums to be paid for land damages and for the extinction of existing water rights. To this must be added the great expense of the maintenance of the costly pumping systems necessitated. Quite forty per cent. of the total yield estimated would have to be obtained by driven wells. Such wells have been found to be somewhat precarious or unreliable as well as expensive undertakings. There may be no need to dwell on this feature.

"Water can be furnished to the city by gravity. It can be secured from ample storage grounds. These can be found remote from the polluting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influences inseparable from thickly populated localities, but the city would be relieved from the necessity of creating and maintaining an expensive system of pumping and carriage, and an intercepting sewerage plan of incalculable cost to protect what supply might be obtained.

"Your committee have experienced great difficulty in getting prompt and accurate information for the completion of this report, and now recognize the fact that Brooklyn must depend on Greater New York for a future water supply from other sources than Long Island."

An interview with the Chief Engineer of the New York Aqueduct Commission, Mr. Alphonse Fteley, January 3, 1898, is very significant. Space will only permit the following brief extracts:

"I regret that the bill offered in the last Legislature to empower the Aqueduct Commission to make surveys for an increased water supply for New York City did not pass, because the Croton watershed limit is nearly reached in the water consumption of New York, which now approximates 230,000,000 gallons daily or more. Moreover, an additional consumption estimated at 25,000,000 gallons daily is expected from the opening of the new 48-inch pipes in Fifth Avenue. Something should consequently be done to investigate new sources of supply.

"There has been a good deal said concerning the Adirondacks, the Great Lakes, and Lake Champlain. The watershed of Lake Champlain is small, and as to taking water from the Adirondack region, it would be a project which would consume a number of years, and the expense would be enormous.

"It is my opinion that an additional source of water supply must be procured, but others should be found which would be sufficient for a long time to come.

"Concerning the plan to utilize salt water for Fire Department purposes, I think the plan is a good one, merely upon the ground that it would furnish a duplicate system for fire purposes.

"It is true that in 1888 I made a joint report in favor of the plan proposed for delivering to New York from New Jersey an independent supply of 50,000,000 gallons per day. I did so for the reason that I am a believer in the principle of having a dual system in view of possible contingencies which, in a city placed like New York, might result in very grave danger. I consider it in the light of an insurance matter.

"If 50,000,000 gallons a day could be delivered into the Croton Aqueduct from the Fort Montgomery water shed, as you say, it would be an excellent thing to rely upon. I do not think, however, that this could be done in two years.

"I have not made a special study of the Esopus water shed, but I understand in a general way that its available watershed is large, and that it could be connected with other drainage areas.

"Brooklyn is even more pressed for water than we are and I am told that something must be done there at once.

"It is a very serious condition of things, and it should have been taken in hand several years ago. I recommended to the Aqueduct Commissioners in 1893 the importance of making surveys for additional watershed. Last

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year the bill asking for authority to survey for additional water supply was introduced, but nothing was done."

The importance of a sufficient gravity pressure cannot be better expressed than by the following statement by Mr. Francis C. Moore, President of the Continental Insurance Co., in a pamphlet entitled "Water Works and Pipe Distribution."

"The best system of water-works for fire extinguishing purposes is a gravity system, with the reservoir at a sufficient elevation to ensure, with full draught, an effective head or pressure *at the hydrants* of eighty pounds to the square inch or not less than forty pounds to the square inch at the base of the nozzle with 250 feet of hose.

"The force of gravity acting with an ample reservoir differs from pump pressure for forcing water through pipes, in the important respect that it is always ready for instant use without notification by means of electric wires, telephones, etc., and it is not liable to break down or get out of order like pumps or other direct pressure appliances. It, moreover, exerts, at all times, a steady pressure on the pipe system, reducing the liability of breakage to a minimum. A gravity system has a decided advantage over a direct pressure pumping system in that (if pipes are of proper sizes) the full volume of flow is instantly available without waiting to fire up extra steam boilers."

In the same paper Mr. Moore illustrates how the water front supply of water may be utilized for fire purposes by fire boats pumping through a proper network of pipe lines within certain areas. While the quantity of water used for fire purposes is small compared with that needed for potable and manufacturing purposes, it is none the less important that all methods to meet the wants of all localities in the municipality should be availed of. An adequate supply of water for all purposes is a prime requisite, and that the first city of the United States in population, commerce and manufactures should be the lowest of thirty of the principal cities in an adequate water supply, as shown by Mr. John H. Washburn, is an anomaly.

To sum up, there are certain main points which are apparent:

1. The need for an additional water supply is pressing in the Borough of Brooklyn, and soon will be in the Borough of Manhattan.

2. The supply should have ample watershed, free from pollution, and be supplied by gravity, with sufficient head to supply our highest buildings. As expressed by a prominent merchant: "We now have a three-story supply for a ten-story town."

3. It should be within the State of New York, and duplicate existing sources, so that if one source fails, it would be supplemented by the other.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. In view of the constitutional limit of taxation, if private capital will furnish an adequate supply at no higher rate than the cost under municipal ownership, it should be taken advantage of.

5. In the Catskill Mountains and their southern foothills, we have a clear, cold, trout-stream supply, from a sparsely settled hardwood forest district, known to every fisherman, with ample volume and an elevation to afford an adequate head to reach our highest buildings, at a distance and at a cost much less than those of the Adirondacks or the Great Lakes, or any other available watershed.

F. B. THURBER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERNATIONAL PIRACY IN TIME OF WAR.

BY W. L. PENFIELD.

I.

In upholding war as legitimate, it has been said that there is not a war which has not contributed to the progress of civilization, with a few exceptions which are cited in proof of the historic rule. The wars of Alexander the Great are instanced in illustration of the rule. But the beneficial effects of such wars are accomplished in modern times by the printing press, steam and electricity; and war can no longer be simply defended as an agent of civilization.

War is not a remedy. It is an evil, of which the remedy is peace. It may remove old political abuses; or it may give rise to new ones, as its object, or incident, or both. Socially, it is not a purifier, but a demoralizer. It is always attended by a train of corrupt and corrupting influences. It leaves its lengthening trail on a generation. It propagates and multiplies social evils; it poisons and saps the springs of national life and power. It is not the school of the heroic virtues. Their nursery is the home, not the camp or the battle-field, which is only a scene of their display; but not more truly so than the Hay-market square, or the seat behind the throttle-valve, or the station at the brake.

The War for the Union was the most necessary of all wars. It was both a war of defence and a war of emancipation. Its end was at once the preservation of our free institutions and the abolition of a vast and spreading social evil.

If all men were reasonable and just, war would be unnecessary. It finds its only justification in their imperfection, in their unreason and injustice—in the necessity of the defence or the emancipation of a people. Yet it is in its essence the attack of the right hand upon the left. The supreme remedy is arbitra-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. As a remedy it is applicable in all cases but a few. But it can never become the sole final resort, until the Millennium comes, when all men will listen to reason and justice; when arbitration will be needless. The war between Spain and the United States is a demonstration of this. It is a people's war—a war between a people on the one hand, maddened by centuries of heaped-up wrongs, cruelties and oppressions; and a people, on the other hand, rushing to the defence of its sovereignty. In the conscience of the one, it is a war of emancipation, in the conscience of the other, it is a war of defence. The conflict was inevitable. The destruction of the "Maine" was only the lighted match to the tinder.

Victor Hugo thought only one more war was necessary—the war of emancipation. America furnishes the sublime spectacle of a war undertaken with the unmixed motive of the emancipation of an alien people; and the war begun for the emancipation of Cuba seems destined to end with the redemption of the Philippines.

II.

War has but one immediate object—to crush the adversary, to render his further resistance impossible; and to compel him to make a just peace.

Some publicists maintain that, in a state of war, all the subjects of each belligerent are enemies of all those of the other. Others, less authoritative, perhaps, but more advanced, because more humane, maintain that it is a duel between nations — between states as such, and not between individuals. But all agree that no state has the right to deprive of life the unarmed subjects of the enemy, unless they make resistance or take part individually in the conflict.

The employment of force is sanctioned and limited by necessity; and only so much stress may be put upon an enemy as may be necessary to overcome his armed resistance. Civilized states do not use the torch except in case of necessity. They do not wantonly destroy life or property. They do not inflict unnecessary suffering or injury of any kind. They do not murder or starve prisoners of war, or non-combatants.

III.

In the present state of international law, including therein

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the principles of the Declaration of Paris, the conduct of war on the seas is governed by the same general rules as are observed in war on land, except as regards the inviolability of private property. In war on land, booty has become unlawful, and respect for the rights of private property is departed from only in extraordinary and exceptional cases. But in war on the high seas, booty, under the name of prize, is a lawful object; and all private ships and cargoes belonging to the subjects of the enemy are liable to capture and confiscation by the adversary. The war is not waged alone against the armed forces of the enemy, but against all his inoffensive commerce in all the sea-borne ships of his subjects, in non-neutral waters.

The Declaration of Paris abolished one form of piracy by privateering; it abolished another of its forms by protecting all goods, whether enemy or neutral (except contraband of war), from capture on the high seas under the neutral flag. But one necessary step remains to be taken—in the adoption of the principle of the inviolability on the high seas of all private property, except contraband of war, whether found in neutral or enemy bottoms. Its adoption has found an obstacle in the frequent association of two phrases — "free ships, free goods" and "enemy ships, enemy goods." The one has been treated as the corollary of the other; and although the latter has so far given way that neutral goods in enemy ships are free, it remains as an imaginary maxim to sanction the spoliation of private enemy property. The association of the phrases has done mischief enough. They should give way to the broader maxim that on the high seas all private property, excepting contraband of war, is free. The persistent, conjoined use of the phrases is a curious illustration of the pernicious effects of legal maxims, after they have become wholly or partially obsolete under changed conditions. But they have a certain charm. They are alliterative; they are epigrammatic; they stick in the memory. But there is no legal or logical relation between them. The first phrase is a maxim which consecrates a principle. The second is not a maxim because it violates an immutable principle—"Thou shalt not steal," from friend or enemy — a rule without exception. It is the law of peace; it is the law of war on land, with no exceptions other than those of necessity. And the capture of enemy private property in time of war, on the high seas, has never been at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempted to be justified on the ground that it is larceny or piracy — the true nature of the act; but on the ground of the supposed necessities of warfare of maritime powers; especially of Great Britain, as being its chief, effective means of warfare. And the regular men-of-war, as well as the volunteer navy, may exercise the right of capture of enemy private merchandise and ships, whether contraband of war or not. In maritime warfare this gives advantage to those nations who maintain powerful navies, which grow apace with the expansion and for the protection of their growing commerce.

IV.

But there is a growing tendency to limit all warfare, on sea as on land, to its true objective — the persons of the armed combatants and the property of the state which strengthens the hand of the enemy.

On May 30, 1792, the French Legislative Assembly unanimously declared in favor of prohibiting the capture of private, unarmed enemy ships, and negotiated with foreign states to that end.

In its war with Spain in 1823, France directed its navy to capture only vessels of war and ships violating an effective blockade.

At the end of the war between Austria, France and Sardinia, by the Treaty of Zurich, in 1859, all Austrian merchantmen, captured and not condemned, were restored.

In March, 1865, the French government decreed the restitution of captured Mexican merchantmen.

In the war of 1866, Austria prohibited the capture of enemy ships and cargoes, on condition that the enemy power should observe strict reciprocity. Germany and Italy adopted the same rule. The King of Prussia ordered that enemy merchant ships should not be subject to capture, on condition of reciprocity, except under the same circumstances as would warrant the seizure of neutral ships. Italy adopted the same rule of freedom, with the exception of ships laden with contraband of war or which should attempt to violate a blockade.

In April, 1868, the North German Diet voted a law authorizing the Federal Government to negotiate an international convention for the adoption of the principle of the inviolability of private property on the high seas.

In July, 1870, the French Legislative Assembly voted urgency

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the consideration of the proposition that private property, during war and peace, upon land and sea, ought to be respected by states as by individuals. In that year the King of Prussia announced that French merchantmen should be free from capture, on condition of reciprocity; but the French government failed to adopt the rule and the Prussian proposal was withdrawn.

Italy has by law, prohibited the capture of merchant ships of an enemy state, which accords the same treatment to the Italian merchant marine.

The attitude of this government from its foundation, down to the outbreak of the present war, has been consistent in its advocacy of the exemption of private property, except contraband of war, from capture at sea. It adopted the principle in the Treaty of 1785, negotiated by Franklin, with Frederick the Great. In 1823, it proposed its adoption by the governments of England, France and Russia. In 1856, it refused to accede to the Declaration of Paris in favor of the abolition of privateering unless the principle was adopted, which failed owing to the opposition of Great Britain. In 1861, Mr. Seward favored its acceptance; and in 1870, Mr. Fish expressed to the Prussian government the hope that "the Government of the United States may soon be gratified by seeing it universally recognized, as another restraining and harmonizing influence imposed by modern civilization upon the art of war." In 1871, it was adopted in our Treaty with Italy, stipulating that in case of war between them, "the private property of their respective citizens and subjects, with the exception of contraband of war, shall be exempt from capture or seizure, on the high seas or elsewhere, by the armed vessels or by the military forces of either party," except in the attempt to enter a blockaded port.

The attitude of this government in this respect is fixed; and whatever might be said for or against the adoption of the principle in the present war with Spain, and as to whether Spain would have probably granted or refused reciprocal treatment, in view of the reservation made by it in regard to privateering (in its acceptance of the principles of the Declaration of Paris), all the arguments which led to the early and consistent advocacy of the principle by this government still obtain.

According to Professor Lawrence, a preponderance of European opinion favors its adoption; and "among jurists a vast

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preponderance of authority is in favor of the proposed change." The Institute of International Law has thrice declared in its favor — in its sessions at The Hague, in 1875, at Zurich, in 1877, at Turin, in 1882. "But Great Britain herself has been the chief obstacle to the adoption of it by international agreement."

In the war of 1870, Bismarck remonstrated with the French government against the treatment of the crews of merchantmen as prisoners of war; and while the French government disregarded the protest, it admitted that the principle would be more in harmony with the present state of civilization. In the opinion of Professor Lawrence, the existing rule "tends to foster the idea that war may be waged by honorable men for their own private advantage;" and "it also carries with it the retention as prisoners of war of the crews of the captured ships, though they are as truly non-combatants as the artisans and miners of an occupied province, whom no one dreams of reducing to captivity."

Of all the great commercial nations, Great Britain alone stands fast by the rule of spoliation; and if its attitude in that respect seems to be sustained by that of the United States during the present war, it is not because this government has changed its principles or reversed its policy, but rather from the belief that under all the circumstances, and in view of the gingerly attitude of Spain in regard to privateering, reciprocal treatment would not have been accorded.

In its essence the confiscation of private property on the high seas is piracy, not less than privateering; for it also appeals to private greed and rapacity. And the eventual acceptance of the new principle seems to be assured; it is growing in constant favor, for it is "written in the conscience of humanity." Its advent was heralded by the Declaration of Paris; the march of events is electrical; the spirit of commerce, swiftly growing and extending its civilizing influence, sways the world; and in conflict with it no law of peace or of war can permanently survive, except so far as essentially necessary to the exigencies of warfare.

W. L. PENFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRINCE VON BISMARCK.

BY EMILIO CASTELAR.

I.

BISMARCK is a colossal figure in modern history. He is the incarnation of German unity. All the greater praise to him for his fidelity to that one idea, because it was only in his later years that it had its birth in his mind, there being every evidence that from his infancy to his maturer years no such conception had ever taken possession of him. We democrats, on the contrary, had unanimously contended for it, in season and out of season, uniting all our forces to propagate it from the time of its germination.

I myself was an enthusiastic champion of German, just as I was of Italian, unity. In 1856, when none supposed that the latter was at hand, I, in speeches which have never been forgotten in Italy, announced its approach and its speedy triumph. Again, in 1861, when none believed that German unity was on the eve of accomplishment, I foretold it, and in newspaper articles which are unknown in Germany, I heralded its advent. I was at that time editor of the *Discusión* of Madrid; and, in commenting, in the course of my duties, upon the results bound to follow from the death of Frederick William IV., a sovereign who was at one and the same time romantic and reactionary, I made certain predictions which have been since fulfilled in the course of events. These predictions are to be found in the above mentioned periodical under date of February 25th and March 10th, 1861. I wrote as follows:

"When the cannon of revolutionary France rolled recently across the summit of the Alps, ready to shatter to pieces the treaty of 1815, the statesman who was the incarnation of that treaty lay dying; he who was the soul of universal reaction (I mean Metternich) was passing away in the smoke of combat. While Italy, happy and free, was forging the crown of her bril-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liant unity, the representative of Italian servitude, Ferdinand of Naples, likewise lay dying, and this very day, which sees the German confederation in upheaval and commotion and when the idea of German unity is more than ever a living issue—while Prussia is compelled in fulfillment of her providential mission to follow the example set her by Piedmont—this very day sees Frederick William IV., the great reactionary—Julian the Apostate of German philosophy and German liberty—after a long and cruel malady, lying stretched on the bed of death."

Inasmuch as a German doctor (Dr. Hossasus) while passing through Seville, saw fit to question my assertions, I answered him in the following language:

"Prussia represents in the world freedom of thought and at the same time she represents in Germany the new political idea. If she does not represent this in philosophy and in history then she represents nothing. In the middle ages, Prussia was simply a wretched vassal of the Teutonic Order, and she was compelled by usage and by law to submit her conscience to the Pope and her will to the Emperor. However, all the great movements of modern thought have resulted finally to the advantage of Prussia. By the Reformation, which preached freedom of thought, she passed from the condition of a vassal to monarchy; by the Peace of Westphalia, which proclaimed freedom of conscience as an international right, she emerged from insignificance to the dignity of a powerful state; and by the force and virtue of that encyclopedic philosophy, whose spirit shared the throne with Frederick the Second, she passed from the condition of a mere German monarchy to the rank of a great European power. Under the influence of the French Revolution, which overthrew the ancient Holy Roman Empire of Austria, Prussia proceeded to aspire to the supreme representation of the Germanic world, and by virtue of a similar revolution in 1848 she was almost on the eve of assuming the crown of the German Empire. Subsequently, by the force and progress of ideas which urge all of us onward, she found herself compelled, willingly or unwillingly, as in the case of Piedmont, to become the sword of liberty and of German unity, as a barrier in the path of Napoleonic ambition; while at the same time she sought to divert Russian aims toward Asia and to suppress in Germany the Austrian Empire, that Nebuchadnezzar of absolutism, as potent as a god and as shapeless as a monster."

While we democrats were giving voice to sentiments like these, Bismarck was proclaiming ideas totally opposed to them. A German burgrave, a landed aristocrat rooted to the soil like the very plants, a feudal seignior to the core, he opposed German unity with all his might whether preached by Frankfort democrats or Erfurt courtiers; and he betrayed the same opposition to it in his fight against that intense republican, Arnold Ruge, as in his contests with that faithful royalist, General Rodowitz. But what more than all else aroused his indignation were the taunting declarations of the democrats that Prussia and her dynasty could never play in Germany the part that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House of Savoy had played in Italy; that is, throw Austria out of the Confederation as the former had thrown her out of Lombardy. As bearing upon this, it is only necessary to cite Bismarck's own speeches, which are very instructive and to me peculiarly attractive. "I shall ever oppose," said this great man in the Prussian Diet in March, 1848, "the projects of those radicals who would assign to the monarch and to the government of Prussia the rôle imposed upon Charles Albert in Italy, thus offering us the sinister alternative of conquering the throne or of being defeated and having to accept a shameful peace." And in August, 1849, he further said in the Prussian Parliament: "The army feels no enthusiasm for the German tri-color; our people do not wish to smother the monarchy in the license common to the people of the South." In December of 1850, we find him saying: "I have no desire to see Prussia requiring and seeking in Germany such a ministry as Turin has to select in Italy; and since the Liberals are so anxious to have us provoke a war with Austria, I would advise ministers on the contrary to embark in a war for principles—not with Austria, but rather with the parliamentary majority, for it is always easier to mobilize a parliament than an army."

Who at that time could have foreseen that it was part of the designs of Providence that this self-same man was destined, ere long, to represent on behalf of Prussia the part played by Sardinia in Italy, and that those Prussian princes and their armies, so suspicious and distrustful of the tricolor, would soon be seen bearing that flag aloft throughout the whole of Central Europe, driving Austria out of Germany, suppressing the temporal power of the Pope, and crushing the Napoleonic dynasty; and all this in alliance with the hitherto despised House of Savoy?

The modern world has been saved by four great apostacies—Peel was an apostate from the protectionist idea, Gladstone was an apostate from Conservative tenets, Thiers was an apostate from the monarchy, and Bismarck in his turn became an apostate from feudalism. What happy results have followed! There has been established a progressive Europe, a Europe vastly different from that of our infancy and our youth.

But Bismarck has made three capital mistakes. To maintain the progress accomplished, he has had recourse to reaction-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ary measures. He has defaced his work by his cynical and insolent annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. And, finally, he has condemned Europe to an armed peace, a state of affairs which, if not speedily terminated by gradual disarmament, will bring universal ruin to our continent.

II.

The contradictions between Bismarck's ideal and the processes employed by him to realize it, give the key to his moral character, as also to the new phase which in his time European politics has assumed. On the psychical side, Bismarck offered great resistance to the admission of new ideas; but, once they were admitted, he displayed indomitable resolution in carrying them out and an equal tenacity in maintaining them. Physiologically, he dominated his nerves as a thinker and as a statesman, calling to his aid his muscles and sinews of steel. He resembled Gladstone, from whom he was so different in other respects, in his habit of showing by contrast a life devoted to rural quietude and at the same time exposed to the nervous strain of the profound thinker and of the gladiator in the arena of daily politics. His patience in the preparation and combination of vast plans can only be compared with the impatience with which he threw them aside when once he had them fairly started on their way. This is a distinguishing and apparently contradictory feature in Bismarck's nature, and it is characteristic of his whole being.

Men's characters are greatly modified by circumstances and by the positions they occupy; for just as habits acquired change the character, so the external impulses of a great event are frequently sufficient to change the whole current of life. Bismarck, even in the midst of the court, always remained the country gentleman, and he continued to be authoritative and commanding in the very center of democracy. He never ceased to guide and control the machine which he was driving toward the new horizons of contemporaneous politics and modern thought; horizons vastly superior to those to which he had been born and to which he was accustomed. But it was certainly not from choice that he found himself the partner of innovators and revolutions. If, therefore, one half of his life should appear to be at such variance with the other half, we must not conclude that he is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incoherent, just as we cannot call him reflective without bearing in mind his vivacity, nor vivacious without bearing in mind his reflectiveness. Although his faculties in their number and proportion preserve a steady equilibrium in their relation to each other, this equilibrium would seem at times to have been disturbed by his fantasies, but he invariably brings a fund of calculation to restore the balance. A great calculator he certainly is, and yet he foresees but little; an old Christian in his faith, he showed himself almost a young positivist in his rule and government of men; and as he made no account of the mystery of political science, so likewise he attached little importance to the affections of the heart.

His has been a double life; he has had a double set of thoughts, a double history, and the one has been constantly at war with the other. How has he preserved the great authority of office, the almost total dominion over sentiment? How has he maintained the iron will and followed the Cæsarian method, swiftly converting words into deeds? At first sight, he presents himself as obedient to a single vocation, and as serving but one cause; that is, he is the personification of Reason in Statecraft. The current of his life, like that of the rivers Rhone and Guadiana, has been at times subterranean, hiding itself deep down—as at Olmutz, for instance, where he posed as the friend of Austria—as though it had disappeared forever; and, running along silently in its course, it suddenly comes into view at Sadowa, where he appeared in his true light as Austria's enemy and conqueror.

How he has lorded it over peoples and kings! But he has found it easier to master others than to master himself; for at times his passions and at times his dogmatic temperament, with a conviction that he was infallible and all powerful, combined to bring upon him innumerable disasters, resulting finally in his humiliation and retirement.

Bismarck lacks the breadth and richness of idea and the variety of emotion which are displayed by poets like Goethe, Lamartine and Byron; but, on the other hand, he is, like them, jealous and captious, and an almost effeminate susceptibility not dominated by his masterful force is but poorly compensated for by a creative and fervid imagination. But, as regards his personal and domestic life, one cannot but be struck with Bismarck's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well balanced temperament and his finely poised will, giving him such pure habits and such regularity in the care and management of his affairs, that one recognizes at a glance the exemplary husband and father, and the incomparable administrator of his own estates. None could accuse him of lacking in force of will, a charge which Schopenhauer brings against the German race. As passion was never kindled into fire by its own inner light, as little in Bismarck's case were dreams ever admitted into his plans. There was never anything of the inspired or of the seer or of the poet; no thought of yielding to the force of institutions or presentiments; nothing but a clear intellect, cold reason, mathematical calculation and an imperious will. These took him by the hand and led him to concrete and constant action.

At the same time, here we find an individual who, notwithstanding his pure habits, despises remorselessly and ignores without shame or scruple all political morality, neither believing in its efficacy nor caring for its purity. But none can fail to see that it was precisely to this moral weakness that the great mistakes of his life are due. The physical forces of the state enabled him to overcome an almost invincible material resistance as represented by the armies of Austria and France. He discovered, however, that such forces were powerless to combat the moral resistance of the papacy, and he found himself compelled to go to Canossa.

Again, he hated profoundly and loved but little. He held Moltke, his collaborator, in high esteem, but he never formed for the silent engineer a cordial and effusive friendship. For the old Emperor William, he felt what one might almost term affection, but he treated him at all times with the respect due from a minister to a great monarch. However, notwithstanding this respect (and in virtue of his own mental superiority as compared with the capacity of his master) he always considered William somewhat in the same light as a capable tutor would his docile pupil.

To know how Bismarck could hate, it is sufficient to cite two of his well-known antipathies—the Empress and Count von Arnim. He displayed no shadow of flexibility in the art of conciliation and compromise for the sake of political expediency. On the contrary, he preserved an invincible haughtiness, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incurred for him the undying resentment of the venerable spouse of Emperor William and the fierce enmity of certain parliamentary groups whose implacability might have been promptly charmed away by a slight exhibition of amiability. Yet he found no difficulty in dissembling, and laying aside his arrogance, when it suited his convenience. He certainly contrived to keep it in check during his dealings with Alexander II. of Russia, when he wished to make use of the Czar, as likewise in his transactions with Napoleon III., whom he deceived like a Chinese. His very rudeness, however, is regarded as a virtue by those who look upon native goodness in those who are highly placed as a confession of weakness; for there are those who consider bad temper more powerful than amiability, just as there are governments who esteem a reign of terror more effective than the law in promoting obedience. Strange, that a man of such force of character as Bismarck should permit himself to be carried away by anger; that one who ordinarily displayed such cynical indifference, should frequently appear so perturbed by the attacks of a hostile press, and that he should never know how to shield himself from such attacks by treating them with a wise contempt! Strange, that one who was so cold-blooded and so sure of his position should lose his equanimity the moment he was subjected to criticism in Parliament; and, above all, that, blinded by fury, he should commit the folly of defying a learned antagonist and challenging him to mortal combat!

Bismarck loved himself with a passionate affection, and it must be confessed that he had many reasons for so doing; but it was with a love which came perilously near being egotism. However, this very egotism, while much to be deprecated in the case of ordinary mortals, becomes almost a virtue in the great, who are bound to preserve themselves not only for their own sake but for the sake of others. After himself, Bismarck's ruling passion was his official status, for he well knew that in the world office bears the same relation to the man as do the oyster beds in the sea to the oyster whom they nourish. He, in fact, made office his religion; and such a surfeit has he had of office, that in the fullness of time one would think he must have not merely satisfied but gorged himself to suffocation. This terrible apoplexy of glory engenders an abnormal love of solitude; for it is there alone that the glorified, not satisfied with the glorifiers, finds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself in the company which he considers the best and the loftiest which this earth offers. Unfortunately, this desire for power which takes possession of some men, generally outlives the opportunities for its gratification, and they seldom become resigned to their loss, thus proving that it requires greater talent to know how to support misfortune than to enjoy prosperity.

In his youth Bismarck loved feudalism, but when he arrived at the height of his fame he believed in no party, considering that he himself was stronger and better than all parties put together.

Thus having attained the summit of his greatness, he paces the island of his power like that shipwrecked mariner who paces the desert rock seeking in vain for company and friendship. Like Napoleon in Saint Helena setting himself down to write history, he, in the quietude of his country house, becomes a press writer, taking a sterile revenge on the authors of his misfortunes, and satisfied if his editorial diatribes, in the shape of theatrical and artificial thunderbolts, should at times resemble those genuine and terrible engines of power which he once directed so well. In these press contests, the very reptiles he once warmed to life in his bosom have turned round to sting him, being urged on by hands which feed them with gold and neither asking nor caring whether those hands be clean or foul. In such militant campaigns, Bismarck has selected, not the principles most in consonance with his traditions, but those most fatal to his adversaries. How else are we to account for his maledictions of that liberty which was the inevitable fruit of the imperial rescripts bearing upon the natural rights of the socialists? How else account for the fact that, while the regionalists were so active and the King of Wirtemberg showed himself recalcitrant to participation in the military manoeuvres of 1893 under pretext of the drought—when the Bavarian deputies loudly complained of the Central budget, and even Baden, ever faithful Baden itself, opposed even to the verge of rebellion the tax on wines—in face of all this, how otherwise account for Bismarck's complaint that there is so little real federalism in the country, a federalism which he, himself, had done his utmost to minimize in favor of unity and centralization? Nothing else would seem to explain his defence of protection when Caprivi, his successor, favored free trade; for, if on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other hand, Caprivi had pronounced for protection, Bismarck would have been the loudest in his cry for free trade. No other reason can be found for his calling Caprivi "Russian," when the latter showed coldness to Austria, and at another time accusing him of imprudence and temerity in making an enemy of Russia if perchance he insisted upon what Bismarck, himself, had initiated as the true German policy—a lasting alliance with Austria.

We cannot but recognize that the deepest, most intense and most absorbing passion of Bismarck's life has been his love for the soil, a love partaking somewhat of the tribal or patriarchal character, but still a comprehensible, not to say a sacred, love. He loves his residence, his castle; then his landmarks, then his territory, next his region, and, finally, Prussia. Germany he desires to elevate to the very foremost rank in Europe, going even so far in his patriotic delirium as to seek to emulate England herself as a colonizing power, and to convert into a first class maritime nation a country which is not yet quite certain of its standing as a continental empire. In this he has experienced the disillusion which I predicted for him at the time he attempted to seize the Carolines; for the empire has not realized its dreams of greatness in Asia, and it exchanged its most valuable possession in Africa for a few poor, steep rocks in the German Ocean.

All this shows clearly how little there is of the Latin in Bismarck, and, notwithstanding the traits of Slavonic origin, how thoroughly German he is in his lack of logic! Just as Frederick the Great, filled with humanitarian dreams and enthusiastic in his adhesion to modern philosophy, allied himself with the despots who conspired to partition Poland, so Bismarck, after having restored to Hungary her national government, after having crowned Italian unity, after having lent his aid to the new born nations on the banks of the lower Danube, after having laid the foundations and cemented the edifice of German nationality —after having done all this, Bismarck completes his work by tearing from France Metz and Strasburg in order to flatter the military party and humor imperial pride. Never in the ages to come will history and humanity pardon him for this, for he has thereby prolonged the age of the conquerors, and submitted us to the rule of war and revenge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

The antinomies in Bismarck's intelligence and the contradictions in his character spring from heredity, and are doubtless atavic. To his father, an agrarian aristocrat of ancient birth, he owes the feudal trait so prominent in his charcacter, and to his mother, daughter of a family of courtiers composed of philosophers and writers, he is indebted for all that is idealistic in his temperament. He was guided from the very outset by reasons of state, and not recognizing in these any conscience or sentiment, it is superfluous to expect to discover in him any degree of faith or phantasy. Faithful to his education, he ignored from the very outset of his career, in his capacity of rudimentary statesman, the new revolutionary idea forced onward in the midst of its material disasters toward a change of methods but not to a change of principles, let alone of object. Such an upheaval from bottom to top as that seen in 1848 had to be repeated in 1851, but the process was reversed, and the commotion then was from top to bottom, and this change of method converted Bismarck into one of the first of revolutionists—not that it instilled into him any love of progressive ideals, but solely from love of Prussia and her history. When he became at Olmutz, in obedience to the superstitions insuperable from his domestic education, a blind accomplice of the enemies and humiliators of his country, he was cited by the King, Frederick William IV., to appear before the Diet of Frankfort, that body which was charged with the duty of restoring the old Germanic confederation and of profiting by the lessons of the last Prussian defeat. It took but two minutes for Paul, the Jew, to become converted and to announce himself as henceforth the apostle of Christ, but it took Bismarck two months to become the champion of German revolution. He had no desire for the radical unity outlined at Frankfort, or for the conservative unity of Erfurt. But, as a consequence of the former, he found himself applauded for his feudal exaltation, notwithstanding the shameful agreement of Olmutz by which Austria sought to dissolve the Zollverein—that customs union in which Prussia dominated, thanks to her economic hegemony. Not succeeding in her design, Austria next tried to thrust herself abruptly into the Zollverein and by so doing put an end to Prussian supremacy. From that moment Bismarck's patriotism revealed to him that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which his intelligence had failed to make clear, and he forthwith abjured what heretofore he had sworn by.

In May, 1851, he arrived at Frankfort, and in June, when the Austrian representative, Count Thun, advised him to renounce the traditions of Frederick the Great, he replied that he could not with facility throw Prussia and reforms overboard. As the Count continued to insist that the Hapsburgs of Austria were called upon to exercise a natural preponderance in Germany, even over the heads of the Brandenburgs of Prussia, Bismarck did not scruple to make a muttered threat of the war destined to break out fifteen years later on. By so doing he joined the ranks of the prophets, and, breathing the spirit of the times, he sounded the death knell of petrified feudalism. With a clear vision he perceived how, as a result of the thirty years' war in the seventeenth century, Austria had been enabled to place herself at the head of Germany, and he forthwith decided that her supremacy had to be overthrown. Notwithstanding this, the King of Prussia sent Bismarck as Ambassador to Vienna, whence the audacious envoy returned shortly afterward bringing with him an increased hatred toward Austria.

The style of his letters written at that time was of the most inflammatory character from a patriotic point of view, beginning, as these letters generally did, with the greatest brilliancy and ending with the bitterest irony. "May God in His final judgment," he exclaims, "show as much mercy to this poor sinner as our king shows for the sins of Austria!" In 1853 there came the Crimean War, and while Austria, with an ingratitude which scandalized the world, began to show a leaning toward the Western powers as against Russia, Bismarck from his embassy showed a marked tendency to favor the latter. To every Austrian project he opposed the greatest obstacles, but without coming to any final decision with respect to the belligerent powers. As soon, however, as he saw Austria become more pronounced in her sympathies, Bismarck began alternately to urge on both France and Prussia against her and at times he scrupled not to stir up the implacable hatred of both of these powers simultaneously against the Hapsburg foe. Animated by these sentiments, he went to Paris at the time of the first Industrial Exposition, and there he had free access to Napoleon III. On his return, and as though by accident, he met

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prince Napoleon at Frankfort, to whom he proposed a common understanding as between Paris and Berlin, the two most intelligent cities of the world. As a pledge of friendship, France smoothed over and arranged the stormy disputes which had for some time been disturbing the relations between Prussia and the Helvetic Canton of Neufchatel; and Berlin in return held back the arm of its king when, in 1859, the latter evinced a desire to intervene in the Franco-Austrian conflict which resulted in the independence of Italy. While matters were thus progressing, Frederick William IV. became incapacitated, owing to a mental malady, and his brother, William, assumed the Regency, subsequently becoming the first German Emperor who did not belong to the Catholic faith.

IV.

He who lacks the habit of estimating aright the law of contradictions will do well to refrain from a study of the Bismarck mind, for he will find nothing there analogous to our Latin nitidity. The biographies of Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini and Ratazzi, the classic statesmen of Italy, seem to us like Greek statues in their symmetry and harmony, so logical and consistent do they show themselves in their sequence. Everything, in fact, of Latin origin seems clear, while everything German appears turgid and obscure: in the former, a logical consistency, and in the latter an incongruity which frequently borders on incoherency.

Where, of all places, did Bismarck go in 1859 to conspire against European stability? To Russia. Named as ambassador to St. Petersburg, once arrived at his post, the diplomatist entirely disappears and we see nothing but the apostle. His one mission seems to be reduced to a continual preaching against Austria. It is clear that, in view of the latter's indisposition to embark in the Crimean War, in favor of Russia, the spirit of international reaction had become dissipated and its most powerful organism, the Holy Alliance, had become dissolved, while with its dissolution there had diffused itself throughout the political atmosphere, like a vivifying oxygen, the idea of nationalities. This ideal had taken flesh and was rapidly making itself manifest. In its march to victory, the revolution was choosing for its instruments the kings of the second half of the nineteenth century, in the same manner as philosophy in the latter half of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the eighteenth century had elected kings to lead it to victory. Victor Emanuel became the incarnation of a revolution which hastened to assume flesh and blood in Italy; Napoleon III. played the same part in France, when he summoned up universal suffrage and the spirit of nationality, while William of Germany followed suit in his hatred of Austria and in his aspirations toward territorial aggrandizement. Nor was Alexander II. of Russia behind, as was shown by his emancipation of the serfs.

In all these movements, the most striking were the manifestations of Sardinia in Italy and of Prussia in Germany. There was this difference, however, between the two: That whereas Sardinia depended more upon right than upon an army to prevail in Italy, Prussia, for the accomplishment of her purpose in Germany, relied solely upon her army. The iron giant called William I. could understand and appreciate no other weapon, and he, therefore, consecrated himself to his army as though it were the sole object of his cult. Forthwith he set to work to forge his sword and to keep it keen and bright. While William was occupied thus, Bismarck was defining and clarifying the national idea to which the army was being educated to devote itself. It was at this time (in 1860) that he journeyed from St. Petersburg to Paris, to which he had been appointed Ambassador. He had not lost his time in the Czar's capital, and one may readily imagine how he spent it in the city of revolutions—that queenly city which, in all her monuments and all her records, shows the ease with which ideas may pass from the domains of vision to the domains of life.

Like the German doctor, Faust, Bismarck, the German Ambassador, translated the Gospel of St. John thus: "In the beginning was the word, and after the word came prompt action," and he proceeded to make himself the man of action in the German revolution. Napoleon III., the eternal conspirator, supported him, like one who, having no one else for the time being to conspire against, amuses his spare hours by conspiring against himself. Again is seen the contrast between the work of Italy and the work of Prussia; for while the former excited in France a lively enthusiasm, the latter aroused nothing but suspicion and distrust. However, when Prussia undertook to do what Italy had done, she set about her task, not like Italy, with the support of her parliament, but directly in opposition to her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parliament's wishes. In order to subject parliament to military law, William found no more capable instrument than Bismarck; therefore, in 1862, he called the latter from Paris to his council, naming him Minister of Foreign Affairs, and shortly afterward (in October) he promoted him to the post of President of the Ministerial Council. Under the spurring of Bismarck, parliament became restive and recalcitrant and rejected all his projects. The Minister became indignant and was more than ever determined to use both king and army for the purpose of accomplishing his darling aim—the unity of Germany. In a burst of passion, he exclaimed in full tribune: "In conflicts such as those impending, it does not suffice to depend simply upon right and reason; we must summon force to our aid;" and there the deputies sat, an impotent majority, incapable, owing to lack of coercive means, of carrying out its own decrees. What a contradiction, this march toward the goal of liberty through a dictatorship! This terrible reaction against parliament and the press, carried to such extremes by the Prime Minister, was viewed with grave concern by Frederick, William's eldest son and the heir to the throne—the sad, humanitarian and philosophic prince whose untimely death was so soon to follow—and he felt compelled to utter his protest. Hence the hatred which ever afterward existed between the statesman of powerful vision and the seer who could see nothing.

But the contradictions of the great revolutionist were not confined to these internal differences—they extended even to exterior politics. Moved by the example of Italy, and hoping to obtain from England and France the same aid which those powers had extended to Italy, Poland rose in 1863. Thereupon, the arch-conspirator and sworn foe of Austria constituted himself assistant to the executioner—to the Czar—and helped to smother in blood that movement which was so analogous to another already working in his own brain and already supported by his own acts. By this cynical conduct, Bismarck not only showed that he was at war with himself, but he forfeited the support of both France and England. *Sic fata voluere.*

EMILIO CASTELAR.

(*To be Continued.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE CULT OF THE DOG.

In watching the intelligent tricks of well-trained dogs, and noting their affection and anxiety for their masters, most people conclude that they are endowed by nature with superior mental qualities, and that a great gulf exists between their minds and that of the ordinary domesticated or wild animal. We are accustomed to associate the dog and horse together as the chief friends of man—both intelligent, affectionate and trustworthy. The dog is supposed to be the result of centuries of artificial selection and training and the "development" process has raised the naturally intelligent animal to a position nearer to man's level than any other class of brutes. But the widespread craze to tame and train wild animals in recent years has yielded results that seem to discredit the accepted theory of the superior intelligence of the dog.

The taming of the ferocious brutes of the forest is not so difficult a task now that their natures are better understood, and they have been found to possess all the intelligence of the dog for performing tricks. Even mammalians as low down as rats and mice are taught to perform wonderful tricks, and, when properly trained, pet birds, mice, and even snakes, have been found to show a decided affection for their master. The affection of the dog for one who is kind to him is nothing unique in the animal world. Wild, unruly elephants have been known to fall down upon their knees in genuine affection at the sight of some old-time keeper and master, whose kindness to them had won their lasting gratitude. A pet lioness at the London Zoo had such an affection for her favorite trainer that when he was removed she showed all the symptoms of a disappointed and broken heart until he returned. Then her demonstrations of joy and affection could not be surpassed by those of the finest bred dog. Monkeys become so attached to their masters who treat them even with partial indifference that they grow lonesome and heart-broken when separated from them for any length of time.

Instances could be multiplied where the instinct of affection, and the natural ability to perform tricks when properly trained, are conspicuously present in the wild animals and birds. That the dog enjoys this distinction more than most of the brutes is due to the fact that he has been constantly with man for centuries, and his domestication has made his abilities more generally known. In his wild life the dog is just as deficient in the qualities that go to make him the chief friend of man as the fox, tiger, lion, or bear. The dog has been taken from his wild, nomadic life and taught to perform tricks almost as wonderful as those exhibited by dogs whose ancestors have been developed for centuries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The domesticated dogs preserve their intelligent propensities only by careful breeding and selection. Cross them, and these abilities fade away. If freed from man's control and association, the dogs will immediately proceed to found a new race of their own and degenerate rapidly to the old primal stock from which they were in remote ages derived. The best place to study the undomesticated dogs, to compare them with the sixty or more artificial varieties recognized on the bench, is in their most natural habitat to-day—in the circumpolar world. It is claimed by science that if all of our dogs—the greyhound, mastiff, spaniel, terrier, and collie—were turned adrift in a country where they would be entirely exempt from all the restraints and associations of man, all typical identity would gradually be lost, and they would assimilate one to another in form and color. The slim, rounded tails would become thick and bushy, the ears would grow short, erect and pointed, the bodies would be covered by a thick bristling hair, and the color would become uniformly tawny, gray or brindled. A composite feral tribe of dogs would result that is best represented to-day in North America by the mongrel Indian dog. Climate would have something to do in moulding the colors and characteristics of the untamed brutes. For instance the prevailing color of the Arctic belt is white, and consequently a great proportion of the wild and semi-wild dogs of the circumpolar region are white, while the North American Indian curs are of a tawny or grayish color.

In the circumpolar region the dogs have been less domesticated by man than elsewhere, and the characteristic propensities of the wild dog can be studied there to advantage. The Esquimaux have had some influence upon the half-tame brutes, but they have trained them only to be beasts of burden. They have never been taught tricks, or even to be the friend and companion of man. They frequently consort with the wolves, and one not well acquainted with the scientific distinctions between a wolf and a dog would not be able to say which should enjoy the noble title of dog. This is equally true of many of the half-wild, gray Indian dogs of the West. A pack of them roving across the prairie would be taken by most strangers for a pack of wolves, and it is a fact, too often witnessed, that if a man should encounter a pack of these mongrel creatures in a lonely situation at dusk he would more than likely be attacked by them. They exhibit the cowardly nature of the wolves by sneaking away from a man with a stick in his hand ready to defend himself, but pouncing upon a prostrate human being.

The wild dog, uninfluenced at all by association with man, is typical of nothing but the wolf, and in the circumpolar ice he is found in numbers roving over the fields of snow and ice, frequently in company with the wolves. The Esquimaux have taken these wild creatures, and by a rude process of selection and training they have developed the "huskie," a colloquial abbreviation of the word Esquimaux. These animals represent a type of dog but little removed from the wolf—hardy, vicious, swift of foot and keen of eye. They have been trained to haul sledge loads of goods across the snow and ice, and this comes as natural to them now as for a pointer to point. They possess the blood of the wolf, however, in their veins —the taint of the jackal. At the first opportunity they will run away and join the wild dogs and deteriorate rapidly in their company. Throughout the great Northwest it is hard work to make up a full team of strictly pure huskies. The leader of a team is invariably a trustworthy huskie, but harnessed behind him will be one or more wild creatures that are kept in harness only through the moral influence of the others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the color of many of the huskies, and from their general form and other characteristics, it is generally concluded that the fundamental type of circumpolar dog has been changed by crossing with the pure white Arctic-fox, the wild coyote, and the big, gray timber wolf. The certain characteristics of all these animals are apparent to the observer, and besides environment, food and climate these wild animals have done much to change the feral types of this cold region. The pure white Esquimaux dog can scarcely be distinguished from the great Arctic fox. The Lapp dogs are about the size of a Scotch terrier, and they have a wonderful resemblance to the lynx. The hair is long and shaggy, with color of various tints, and they are taught by the Lapps to fight off the wolves from the reindeer. They are consequently great fighters, and never associate with the wolves, but consider them their eternal enemies, showing pretty conclusively that they have but little wolf blood in them. The dogs of Iceland are somewhat similar to those of Lapland and Greenland. They have long hair, curled tails, pointed nose and ears, and very irritable tempers. The dogs of Spitzbergen resemble more distinctly the representative Esquimaux dog, both being white, and very similar in form and general characteristics.

Crossing with the wild animals of the country thus changes the color and shape and temperament of the dogs as much as climate and food. In Siberia the wolves are black and not white or gray, and the fact is shown in the colors of the wild dogs. Most of the dogs of Siberia are black, brown, or reddish brown, and they howl like wolves, associate together in packs, hunt together, and dig holes in the snow and earth to shelter themselves from inclement weather. They live chiefly on frozen fish, and on this diet they will travel hundreds of miles day after day. The native tribes train the dogs to haul loads across the country, and to hunt.

The Kamchatkan dogs are remarkable beasts of burden, and they probably represent the most sagacious feral type of the circumpolar region. They are trained severely by the natives to haul heavy loads across the ice, and their tempers are soured by the hard lessons of training they have to undergo when young. They are consequently unruly and uncompanionable, and the driver, to exact obedience, frequently has to stun the animals with blows on the head. They are somewhat of a huskie type, with sharp noses and ears, bushy tails and shaggy hair.

In Alaska the breed of dogs are of a reddish brown, and are as much wolf as dog. They are strong, voracious, and hardy. A team will draw five hundred pounds behind them, and in the winter time their diet consists of forty frozen herring a day or one large salmon. They show the wolfish nature whenever approached by strangers, or when they get a smell of fresh meat. They are little better than the wild wolves except that they have been taught to drag loads behind them. Such a thing as saving a man's life or being affectionate and lovable to their masters, has never been heard of, and the ordinary instincts and propensities of our domesticated dogs appear entirely foreign to their natures.

The Esquimaux huskie is taken as a rule as the type of circumpolar dog, but that they do not all conform to this type is apparent from these descriptions. Along the Mackenzie River there is even another type differentiated in many ways from any of those mentioned. The breed is called Athabaskan and the animals have very long, curly hair. When crossed with the Esquimaux huskie the hair becomes so long that the eyes are scarcely visible. This breed has been crossed and recrossed with others, so that the Athabas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kan dog of to-day is generally a hybrid, much larger and stouter than the original breed.

Along Smith's Sound there is a powerful breed of dogs that do not hesitate to attack the most ferocious wild animal. They frequently hunt in pairs, and two of them will unhesitatingly attack the most formidable bear. They have been tamed for hunting purposes, and they will corner the largest grizzly and hold him at bay until the hunters can shoot him. One dog is powerful enough to bring down a reindeer, and kill him in a minute. They are keen of scent, and can detect the presence of a seal under the ice, or smell a deer a quarter of a mile away. They have a thick, furry coat of a tawny brindled color, and in the winter their bodies are covered with a thick fleece of wool. They so closely resemble the wolf of this region that they are readily mistaken for one. They are very similar in appearance and disposition to the Greenland dogs. In Labrador there is a nondescript stock of dogs so fierce in nature that it is customary to suspend a heavy wooden log by a rope to the neck, which impedes their actions so as to make them less dangerous to man and weaker dogs. The true Labrador dog exhibited on the bench has nothing to do with this variety, for, strictly speaking, the Labrador breed is not a circumpolar creature, for he weakens and dies with the temperature at sixty degrees.

The dog is the least pure of our pet animals. His ancestors were the most depraved types of animals and his title is bad. In the northern latitudes he is taught to carry loads and to hunt wild animals; in the Eastern countries he is a scavenger; and in ancient times he was taught to devour the dead. He has been domesticated and trained for ages so that many of his original traits have been obliterated, but the taint of the jackal is there and the wolfish blood is sure to crop up. Turn him loose and exempt him from man's influence and he soon degenerates and returns to his original mongrel type. The question of placing such an animal upon a pedestal and claiming for him all the good traits and mental endowments of a superior creature is unscientific. If we must have pets there are other creatures cleaner and more intelligent by nature.

GEORGE E. WALSH.

A STRIDE IN IRISH CIVILIZATION.

THE movement in Ireland that is destined to elevate the social condition of the agricultural laborers is an interesting and hopeful outcome of agitation. Although initiated for leverage purposes, with few real friends as sponsors, it acquired a force during the Land League Campaign that compelled recognition by the government.

In the struggle to obtain equitable land laws, strength was added to the public assemblies by the presence of laborers. Their wrongs were discussed on the same platforms from which those of the farmers were eloquently ventilated. The conditions in which they lived were so utterly degrading that it was impossible to attempt a truthful description without presenting a thrilling picture of human suffering. And this picture drew tears from the laborers themselves. The hideousness of their debasement had not been perceived until it came to be set forth by sympathetic speakers.

It did not appear that the laborers were blameful for living in one-roomed hovels with pigs and poultry because there were sanitary laws that made it a misdemeanor to do so. A class steeped in poverty could not rise

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from wretchedness without some form of government help. This view was so strongly urged that, when the farmer had received the first substantial advantages from legislation, a law was enacted which encouraged the belief that every laborer would be provided with a cottage and half an acre of land.

It is fifteen years since both houses of the British Parliament passed the measure which was to make a new Ireland. Within that period something over 11,000 cottages have been built and occupied. A very small percentage of the agricultural laboring class is represented in the achievement, but there has been a lesson learned that compels a greater speed in the developments hereafter.

The law of 1883 provided that the Irish Local Government Board could order the carrying out of a scheme of improvement initiated by the local sanitary authority. Cottages could be built and land taken for half-acre plots provided that an agreement could be arrived at with the owners and occupiers. In case of opposition confirmation would have to be made by Act of Parliament.

While the Irish National representatives continued to act as a unit, the machinery of the Land League (National League) was sufficiently powerful to prevent disagreements. The occupiers did not relish the prospect of having choice pieces cut from their farms, but feared to excite the anger of the League by outspoken disapproval. After Parnell was dethroned a new order of things prevailed. The "union of hearts" was dissolved and the farmers, having regained independence, soon manifested their real feelings in regard to allotments.

Fortunately for the ultimate success of the movement a beginning had been made that was enough to intensify the longing for a generous administration of the Act of Parliament. The laborer who had secured a cottage, with the coveted half-acre, was the most envied of the residents of his district.

One would have to be present and witness the transfer of a family from a stone or mud hovel to a three-roomed trim cottage to be able to fully appreciate the elation it produced. Coming into possession of such a house was to the numerous children like the fulfillment of a fairy's promise. At nightfall they crept in and out of the two rooms adjoining, mounted softly by the ladder to the cozy room in the gable, and went to sleep unwillingly, fearing lest the "new grandeur" should vanish.

It was understood that a rent of twenty-four cents a week was to be paid for the privilege of occupation, but that was little enough for the beautiful cottage, not to speak of the bit of land for potatoes and cabbage. Hitherto their fertilizers had gone to improve fields in which they had no interest beyond the crops of one season.

The process of collecting material for an ordinary fertilizer is so painful as to make it appear to be more valuable than gold. In the districts where limestone is employed for road-repairing, grass grows luxuriantly along the road fences. It is gathered by laborers' children, and placed in pits to rot. This is considered to be easy work in comparison to that which, for a similar object, has to be done in the mountainous districts. The materials for road-repairing in the mountains usually have no fertilizing properties, and grass is neither rich nor plentiful. Bare-footed, ragged children often have to travel miles to obtain a few poor wisps for the slimy pits at the front door.

The act of Parliament dating from 1883 was to continue in force for five years, but although known from the first to be a weak measure, it was not amended until 1885. The act then passed gave the Lord Lieutenant of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ireland and the Privy Council the power to sanction or reject schemes to take by compulsion the lands necessary for allotment. It provided that in certain conditions laborers in towns might be given half-acre gardens, and it defined the agricultural laborer as "a man or woman whose occupation is the doing of agricultural work for hire, and includes a herdsman."

Still, it was not possible to proceed with the administration of the law at more than snail's pace, and in 1886 it was further amended. Fishermen and hand-loom weavers doing agricultural work were brought within the definition of agricultural laborers, and there was a provision for permitting laborers to occupy allotments pending the erection of cottages.

In 1891 the crop of bills during the Parliamentary session included another act to amend. This made it easier to get representations before the Local Government Board in regard to the housing of laborers, and provided for the carrying into effect of an improvement scheme in the event of failure to do so by the local sanitary authority. Each amendment appeared to have some weight, but the opposition was usually so fierce that a further act to amend passed in 1892, increasing the allotments to one acre.

No arguments have been used against the principle of allotments that were strong enough to entitle them to the respect of a disinterested person. Too frequently such arguments are based on no higher ground than the selfishness that is begotten of "land hunger."

If the farmers have a grievance at all it is that the pieces of allotments are nearly always taken from their best fields. It does not matter to them that the rental is reduced in proportion, or that it would be unfair to select the poorest land for the half-acre or acre intended to supply the chief requirements of a family.

The changes in farming operations have rendered it necessary to place the agricultural laborers on a basis of this kind in order to prevent increase of pauperism or wholesale emigration. Farmers are able to get along with very little hired help. Machinery and the system of *Kooring* or exchanging work, have become more popular, especially in the province of Munster. *Kooring* is held in high favor because it brings the young people, sons and daughters of farmers, together nearly every day in harvest. Compensation for hard work includes evenings devoted to feasting and portions of nights to dancing, courting and match-making. There was a time when Irish laborers went every year to England and Scotland to assist at harvesting. Alteration in agricultural methods and depression put an end to this market.

By a later Parliament, still another bill was passed to facilitate the working of the Laborers Acts. It was promised by the government as a concession to the Anti-Parnellites, who had introduced and withdrawn a measure with this object in view. The chief secretary for Ireland, Mr. Gerald Balfour, intimated that something would be done by the Treasury to help to place the cottages and allotments of land upon such a footing as that the local tax-payers may be relieved from the burden of having to pay annually the difference between the amount charged for rent, $12.48, and the interest on loan for purchase of land and erection of cottage, about $24.

It is not expected that any scheme for building laborers' cottages will pay directly. At present it costs the tax-payers a great deal to maintain the poor in monster buildings called Unions. Some of these are occupied by as many as 2,000 people each, including sick, infirm and able-bodied. They were originally known as workhouses, and enough was done in them by way of industry, to justify the appellation. Work became unpopular, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they have since been chiefly remarkable as hot-beds of corrupting influences. The children born within their walls too often go to swell the ranks of the thriftless and the criminal. The system throughout has but one redeeming feature and that is care for the sick.

With a thorough administration of the Laborers' Acts, pauperism would diminish. The self respect generated by removal from the tumble-down, one-roomed hovel to the wholesome, lime-washed cottage would make the poor-house impossible as a refuge.

The Irish people in foreign lands speedily adapt themselves to their surroundings. In their own country the processes which effect a change in habits and customs must be powerful when they succeed against the rooted prejudices of centuries. Bearing this in mind, one cannot view without emotion the results in the case of the Irish laboring class.

It seems a long step from a hovel, with a disease-breeding pool at the front door, to a cottage adorned by trailing vines and bordered by flower-beds bright with color.

This wonderful transformation was accomplished during one season in Ireland. A philanthropic resident of Cork provided flowers and shrubs for the experiment and published a list of prizes for the best flower plots and beds of vegetables. The result was an agreeable surprise to all who visited the cottages. The front yards were tastefully laid out, showing to advantage annuals and perennials.

Those who have travelled in Ireland know that nothing so pitifully appeals to the stranger as the tumble-down houses of the laborers. There is hardly one out of the thirty-two counties wholly free from this blot upon the paternalism which the British governmental system engenders. It would be disappointing to tourists if the hovel and the tatterdemalion were to disappear from the elements that make for the picturesque, but there are few who would not rejoice at such a gain for decency and good morals.

GEORGE HENRY BASSETT.

HUNGER AND POVERTY IN ITALY.

IT is the economical condition of Italy which has brought about the present political situation there. The clamor for bread was the cause of the uprising called "bread riots," but the recent revolt was brought on by the government, which, through mere fear of revolution, turned the troops against its unarmed citizens. The reasons for revolt were very strong and have long existed, with consequent agitation against the government. To quell this agitation effectually the government has found the means, and the occasion was made an excuse for entirely suppressing the opposition in the press and in Parliament.

The condition of Italy has not been known abroad because of the strict censorship of the press and the telegraph. The truth could not be told in Italy. All mouths that could not be stopped by corruption or in some other way were silenced by imprisonment or banishment to regions where they would not be heard from. The few who told the truth abroad were not believed, for the truth was too terrible to be believed easily, and it seemed that if such a state of affairs existed it would already have been known.

A disease is known by its symptoms. The fact that each year in Italy a hundred thousand persons go mad with hunger, while thousands die of the *pellagra*, hunger-madness, shows that the malady from which Italy is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suffering is starvation. The hundreds of thousands in a half demented state, called *la melancolia*, show that this malady is general.

The Italians are justly ashamed of being the only nation afflicted with this scourge. They try to find an excuse by saying that if the peasants would not eat spoiled grain they would not have the *pellagra*. But the peasants often have nothing else to eat. Italy does not raise enough food for its inhabitants and its people are without money to buy.

The other matter of the salt seems at first a trifle. There is plenty of salt in Italy. The salt mines of Sardinia are famous. Rock salt is produced there at a cost of one *centesimo* a kilogram. A tax is put on it which brings it up to 40 *centesimi* a kilogram. Thus it costs the consumer forty times more than it should (about what sugar costs here). One would say that the salt required is so little that the cost of it would be a trifle; but in Italy it is a very noticeable item in the expenses of even a well-to-do family eating much less in bulk than the peasants must do to exist, for they live principally on a diet of *polenta* (corn meal porridge). The fact is that the peasants cannot afford to put enough salt in their food to make it digestible. So lack of salt is reckoned as one of the chief causes of the *pellagra*.

What people and animals suffer from lack of salt is well known; yet the Italian Government, in need of money always, raises it by taxing food more and more heavily, especially salt; for both the rich and the poor must eat salt. Thus the salt tax is its largest revenue.

The sufferings of *pellagra* are those well known in times of famine. The effects sometimes do not entirely disappear. A woman of my acquaintance near Monza, who had had the *pellagra* some years before, was considered cured. She was the wife of a prosperous shop-keeper when I knew her. The only remaining trace of her malady was that from time to time she stopped in conversation, a look of anguish came into her eyes, and she would say in her dialect: "*Il pan l'è bon, e il vin l'è bon, ma il pan l'è bon! Bread* is good, and wine is *good, but bread is good!*" The horror of that suffering from starvation had never left her.

A newspaper office is perhaps as good a place as can be found to see and know what is going on in a country. Documents of all sorts pass before one there, much that is interesting that cannot be published—at least in Italy, with its press censorship. An American in Italian journalism is astonished to see how much there is that cannot be published because of its being too true. But the most curious of all are the items which can be printed freely because they are facts accepted as a matter of course. The following will illustrate: A box was sent to the paper with which the writer was connected containing what appeared to be a cake of mud. It was covered with a thick, green mould, and looked as though it had come from a ditch. The box was marked "bread," and the newspaper which accompanied it contained the following article:

"*Bread of Clay and Acorns.*—They are little discs or biscuits rolled flat and adhering to each other in groups, of a material which only a chemical analysis could determine. In five or six days they are covered with a green growth of mould in long filaments. Thus they bring to mind the fungi growing on old oak trees.

"The housewives gather red clay and boil it. In the thick broth of clay they throw chopped acorns until the water is all absorbed and there remains a dense black mass, which they set to rise, and afterward lay in flat pieces to dry. When it is dry it is ready to serve at table.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Bread thus prepared is usually abundant, except in years when acorns are scarce. Then the pigs compete with the people; a competition all the more dangerous because the pigs—gluttons that they are—eat the acorns but not the clay."

Our paper merely remarked: "The *dura* of the Africans, whom we have an ambition to civilize, is much more fit for human beings."

Americans will wonder why these poor mud-eaters do not emigrate to America. There is no danger of that, for they are too poor to get away, Neither will the hunger-mad nor the cave-dwellers emigrate. For, according to official statistics, there are 260,000 in Italy who dwell in holes and caverns.

If statistics were taken to tell the story of ruin, neglect, cruelty, oppression and almost desolation of Italy, the tale would horrify the civilized world. But the Italians themselves are so hardened to it that nothing surprises them, unless it is that there is still strength left to rise.

The worst is that no serious measures of relief are being taken. The government, while squandering millions for the prestige of the monarchy, gives nothing but a small sum, amounting, when divided among those suffering with the hunger madness, to twenty-five cents each *per year*. That could not be called a serious measure of relief. The general poverty is so great that it seems hopeless and useless for private citizens to attempt to relieve it by charities. Besides, everybody knows that it is not a question of charities, but a political question.

More serious even than the expensive standing army is the still more expensive bureaucracy supported by the monarchy—and supporting it—which squanders the money of the people. With malefactors in control of the government and surrounding the king, who shows by his attitude that he is utterly indifferent to the welfare of the country, good people in Italy have been completely discouraged. The abuses and corruption of the government were exposed by Dario Papa in the press, and afterward in Parliament by Felice Cavalotti. The government could not suppress these men, for they were patriots and had fought in the war of independence. But now that Felice Cavalotti has been killed in duel by a conservative member of Parliament and Dario Papa is dead of heart failure, struggling for the oppressed of Italy, the government considers the moment favorable for suppressing the opposition. The entire press of the opposition is now silenced—not only the republican *Italia del Popolo*, but the *Secolo*, which had the largest circulation of any newspaper in Italy; also the clerical organ, *L' Osservatore Cattolico*, whose editor, the priest, Davide Albertario, has been arrested. Opposition in Parliament has been suppressed by imprisoning all the leaders of the extreme left.

The Pope is not plotting to overthrow the monarchy, for he knows that it will fall even without his interference. The Catholics hardly expect to regain the temporal power of the Pope, but they hope to have a position of more dignity in a republic than that which they hold under the House of Savoy.

The Republicans are not inciting the people to revolution; they only prepare for what will surely come. They hope that it will be a revolution, not a hecatomb; but if leaders are not prepared, if the people are not educated to act with reason, it is believed that Italy will see a reign of terror, destruction and slaughter such as the world has never known.

MRS. DARIO PAPA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED